S. HRG. 99-394

SCOPE AND IMPACT OF NARCOTIC TRAFFICKING IN ALASKA

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINATION OF THE SCOPE AND IMPACT OF ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING OF DRUGS IN ALASKA

AUGUST 30, 1985

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

56-679 O WASHINGTON : 1986

S541-19

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
STRONG THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
MALCOM WALLOP, Wyoming
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CLAIRBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
KATHRYN O'L. HIGGINS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

PAULA HAWKINS, Florida, *Chairman*

DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
(Ex Officio)

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(Ex Officio)

JOHN DUDINSKY, *Counsel*
MARSHA RENWANZ, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1985

	Page
Angie, from the Adolescent Residential Center Reaching for Help; and Jim of the Akeela House in Anchorage	4
Basler, Mia, representing committee appointed by the Anchorage Council of Parents and Teachers Association	60
Prepared statement	62
Carlos, accompanied by David Melocik, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Department of Justice	22
Coast Guard, prepared statement	97
Dashner, Dr. Steven, deputy superintendent of schools, city of Anchorage, AK	12
Felix, Matthew C., State coordinator, State office of alcoholism and drug abuse, Department of Health and Social Services, State of Alaska, prepared statement	101
Nelson, Lawrence J., special agent in charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, prepared statement	91
Ostrosky, Hank, commercial fisherman	67
Pavolkoh, Randy, cabdriver	65
Segal, Bernard, Ph.D., Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies, University of Alaska, Anchorage, prepared statement	107
Sundberg, Hon. Robert, commissioner of public safety, State of Alaska, accompanied by Lt. Tom Stearns, Glenn Herbst, police chief, Dillingham, AK; Gary Liming, special agent in charge of the Seattle Field Division of the Drug Enforcement Agency, U.S. Department of Justice; and James Swartz, assistant U.S. attorney for the State of Alaska	33
U.S. Customs Service, Pacific Region, prepared statement	86

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Articles, publications, et cetera:	
Department of Public Safety position paper, Robert J. Sundberg, commissioner	81
Communications to:	
Murkowski, Hon. Frank, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska, from:	
D.A. Anslinger III, chief of police, city of Ketchikan, Alaska	70
Cynthia E. Aiken, MS, executive director, the Center for Drug Problems, Anchorage, AK	72
Lynda G. Adams, treasurer, Ketchikan Families in Action, Ketchikan, AK	74
Mike Van Eerd, youth substance abuse counselor, Gateway Community Mental Health Center	85

SCOPE AND IMPACT OF NARCOTIC TRAFFICKING IN ALASKA

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1985

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY,
DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Anchorage, AK.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in Courtroom One, U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building, 701 C Street, Anchorage, AK, Senator Frank H. Murkowski presiding pro tempore.

Present: Senator Murkowski.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURKOWSKI

Senator MURKOWSKI. We will call the hearing to order. This is a hearing of the U.S. Senate full Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism, and the chairman of that committee is my colleague from Florida, Paula Hawkins. I am acting chairman today. The intent of the hearing will cover the scope and impact of narcotics trafficking within our State of Alaska. The hearing will be conducted under three specific panels, and we have representatives of the first panel with us this morning.

Again, I want to thank and recognize the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Paula Hawkins, for her contribution in making available members of her staff, and expertise, because this is one of a number of hearings that has been held throughout the country. Representing Senator Hawkins and sitting on my right is John Dudinski, and on my left, Sheila Rogan, a member of my staff in Washington, DC. They have played a major role in developing material for the hearing.

It, as I have indicated, is part of a series of hearings that have been held across the United States into the threat of drug trafficking. Previous hearings have been held in Arizona, Alabama, Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, New York, and the District of Columbia.

We have all heard of recent reports by health and law enforcement agencies in Alaska which have revealed a rather frightening trend. The use of every type of illegal drug, from heroin to LSD in Alaska far exceeds the national average.

Of course, we are aware that drug abuse costs society a great deal of money, productivity, and an analysis done by the Research Triangle Institute of North Carolina shows that we lose roughly $47 billion annually due to the cost of drug abuse. And it is inter-

esting to put that in some comparison, that is about 5 percent of our Federal budget. It stands to reason that the State of Alaska and its businesses and its productivity, schools, social organizations are also experiencing the same loss of productivity due to drug abuse.

Drug abuse by Alaska's youth is also much greater than the national average, I am sorry to say. And a 1983 survey entitled, "Patterns of Drug Abuse: A School Survey," and the individual who conducted that survey, Mr. Bernard Segal, is with us today and will be introducing testimony for the record as well. But the results of that survey showed that cocaine usage in Alaska high schools is three times the national average. The survey also found that 72 percent of Alaska's high school seniors have used marijuana, compared with 59 percent in the lower 48. One can readily come to the conclusion that drugs, hard drugs, are readily available to young people within our State.

And to highlight the real meaning of the statistics, I have permission to share a written record which is submitted as part of the testimony from Lynda Adams, a parent from Ketchikan, AK. Lynda has been active in working with Ketchikan Families in Action programs associated with drug abuse.

She has recounted the testimony from a student in Ketchikan who had had drug abuse problems. The young man has indicated that he personally knew 75 individuals in school, students who were selling drugs. This is out of a student body of 800.

I happen to be a graduate of that high school, although that was many years ago, and, of course, the population was a lot less, and we did not even know how to spell drugs at that time.

The individual said that he was approached as much as 10 times a day with the opportunity to purchase, "something." This is certainly a tragic situation. I welcome any suggestions from those who have agreed to testify today, or from other interested citizens, on what can be done to rid our schools and youth of the drug exposure.

Other indicators of the extent of the drug problem come from Alaska's law enforcement agencies. Seizures of illegal narcotics have doubled over the past 5 years, and now exceed approximately $5 million within our state. Cocaine seized on Alaskan streets is nearly 60 percent pure, compared with 10 years ago, when it was running aboit 10 percent pure. And there is a direct relationship between drug use and crime.

There was a study done by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and they studied approximately 243 heroin addicts in one community on our east coast over an 11-year period. They found that 243 addicts over an 11-year period committed 500,000 crimes. So the addicts obviously are little more than walking crime machines. And, of course, as trafficking increases, we can expect to see an increase in crime.

We have for the record written testimony from the United States Coast Guard. The subcommittee is informed that Alaska may increasingly be used as a transshipment point for smuggling drugs from the Orient. The Coast Guard points out that the most widely used great circle shipping route from the Far East to the west coast of the United States passes by or through Alaska waters. And be-

cause of our State's very large coastline, and literally thousands of isolated bays, Alaska is becoming an attractive port of entry for major narcotics traffickers.

Narcotics trafficking is now a multibillion dollar business. As the United States enhances its interdiction efforts in the Southeast and Southwest, the sophisticated and well-funded traffickers will look for new routes for smuggling narcotics into our Nation With an estimated $100 billion in narcotics available, today's drug dealers are not only well-armed with the most modern high tech communications equipment, planes, boats, and weapons, but our law enforcement agents have found themselves outmanned, outspent, and outgunned.

Some of the exhibits we have here are representative of guns that have been confiscated by personnel in Alaska in the process of tracking down drug dealers and those that sell drugs.

Ninety percent of the illegal drugs consumed in the United States are produced abroad. No cocaine and no heroin are produced in America. In an effort to stop drugs at their foreign source, I, as well as a number of my colleagues, have used our position, particularly on the Foreign Relations Committee, to make foreign aid a tool for fighting illegal drugs.

I have cosponsored, along with others of my colleagues, and fought for the passage of the diplomacy against drugs amendment which cuts off foreign U.S. aid to major narcotics producing countries. Foreign aid is an investment in the future well-being of another nation, and if they are unwilling to help eradicate their illegal narcotic crops, they are certainly a poor investment for the American taxpayer.

Now, there is no magic bullet which is going to quickly and easily end the national menace of illegal narcotics. Today's hearing is an important opportunity to investigate the scope and impact and seek recommendations. An issue that I intend to address specifically today is what law enforcement officials believe that the impact, if any, of Alaska's liberal marijuana law has on their ability to carry out their jobs in an effective and efficient manner. Only through coordinated education, law enforcement, and diplomatic initiatives can we effectively combat this threat.

As I indicated, we will hear from three panels. The first will be composed of former drug abusers, who are now in treatment programs. They will discuss the scope and impact of narcotics on youth.

Our second panel will be a major convicted Latin American narcotics trafficker who will testify anonymously about moving drugs through Alaska. Because he is presently in Federal prison, and due to concerns about his security, his appearance will be concealed.

The final panel will be composed of State, local and Federal law enforcement officials, and they will testify concerning recent trends in narcotics trafficking into Alaska.

It is hoped that as a consequence of this hearing and general public awareness that the public will evaluate the threat, and will respond accordingly.

I would now like to move into panel 1. Our first panel is composed of people who have had a problem with drug abuse in the past, and are participating in treatment programs. I would like to

welcome Jim of the Akeela House in Anchorage, and Angie from the Adolescent Residential Center Reaching for Help to today's hearing.

I express to you both my admiration for your courage and—and in customary form, I guess, we will call on Angie first.

Would you care to begin by briefly telling us something about your experience with drugs? And then I would like to pose a few questions to you, after we have heard from Jim, as well.

I might ask that you speak fairly close to the microphone, please. If you could give us a little background maybe, when you first began to experiment with drugs, and what kind of drugs were available, and so forth.

STATEMENTS OF ANGIE FROM THE ADOLESCENT RESIDENTIAL CENTER REACHING FOR HELP; AND JIM OF THE AKEELA HOUSE IN ANCHORAGE

ANGIE. When I first started to experiment with drugs I was about 11½, almost 12 years old, and I lived in Florida at the time. There was always drugs around. There was always pot. At least pot and alcohol, and people sold acid and cocaine. You could get just about anything. But I first started out on pot and alcohol. And at first, it was just, you know, because all the other kids were using it, so I wanted to be in with the crowd.

And as I got older I started having problems with my family, and we moved up to Anchorage. And there was incest in my family, and I used drugs more and more. I got into coke and speed, and we would go out all the time and use. And then I started getting into trouble, stealing cars and joyriding, and stuff.

And then I got picked up for shoplifting the first time, and I did not think nothing of it, so I went back out again. Started running away from home, and I was using real heavily, daily. And I finally got caught shoplifting, and I went into McLaughlin, and I started thinking about everything that had happened to me, and where I was headed, and it did not look like I would go anywhere, except for down.

So then I heard about ARCH, which is a very good place, that I went to, and I got into it, and I was there for 7½ months, and it just changed everything that I had ever thought about myself, that—and once I graduated from that program, I found that there were people, other people than me, that did quit using drugs, and there was places I could go to talk to those people and get support. So that then I started—I go to a 12-step program which really helps me out a lot. That is just a brief history.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thanks, Angie.

I am wondering. You came to Alaska from Florida, I gather, is that correct? How did you find the availability of drugs here? Was it more, less, or about the same?

ANGIE. It was more, because up here you can walk into school, walk up to somebody who looks like they do drugs, and ask them for just about anything, and they can get it for you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. In school?

ANGIE. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What grade of school were you in?

ANGIE. I went to East High School

Senator MURKOWSKI. And were you a freshman, sophomore, when you moved up?

ANGIE. I was a freshman.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And drugs were readily available?

ANGIE. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What type of drugs could you buy at school?

ANGIE. We could buy speed, acid, pot, sometimes you could get coke, and some people sold, like Valium, and stuff like that, too.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Were the drugs delivered in school, or did you have to go out and get them off the school premises?

ANGIE. Sometimes you had to go with the people at lunch and go off and get them, but most of the time they had the drugs on them in school.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What was the cost of speed, or heroin, or coke?

ANGIE. Well, speed was like four hits for a dollar or $1.50, and then you could get acid for like $5. Coke was real expensive. It is like $70 for a half gram?

Senator MURKOWSKI. Were there a lot of people pushing drugs? Or the availability?

ANGIE. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. If you wanted them, in other words, you could find them?

ANGIE. You could find them, if you wanted them.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you have to have cash?

ANGIE. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So there was no credit privileges?

ANGIE. No, you always had to have money.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would they sell them to anybody?

ANGIE. Yes. It did not matter what age you were.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How did the kids pay that kind of price? Where did they get the money?

ANGIE. Some people stole it, or some people, like stole bikes and stuff, and sold them for money.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any idea how many of your freshman class were occasionally using drugs?

ANGIE. Occasional. I knew at least about 50 or 60 people that were friends of mine that used drugs.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you sense that the school authorities were working with educational programs, or was there literature available, or did you have an alternative? Because at that age, why, you know, you were making some free choices, I assume, and——

ANGIE. Well, I do not think the school really knew what was going on. We had, like people that would come in and talk to us about drugs, but nobody—we did not really care at the time, so it did not matter to us.

Senator MURKOWSKI. If you could pass on some of your observations to a younger brother or sister, have you got any words of wisdom?

ANGIE. Well, one thing I would say would be not to try and be in with the crowd, because that was one thing I did most of the time,

because I thought I was not good enough for the people who made straight A's, and all that kind of stuff. So I wanted to be in the other in-crowd.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What happened to your grades when you were taking drugs?

ANGIE. They dropped.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Not much?

ANGIE. To like D's and F's.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Was there use of drugs in the school itself? In other words, did some of the young people take drugs in school?

ANGIE. People would take speed, people would take Valium. Some people would be crazy enough to take acid. They would go out, in between classes, and try to smoke in the smoking area, smoke pot. They would leave at lunch, go get stoned, and come back to school. So yes, quite a few people did use it in school.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And I assume that some of the teachers were aware of it, and did the best they could, send them to the school nurse, or whatever?

ANGIE. If anybody found out about anybody being on drugs, we could be suspended.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You got suspended?

ANGIE. Plus they called in the cops.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I see. How old are you now?

ANGIE. Seventeen.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And you are—pretty confident that you are licking the problem you had?

ANGIE. Now that I have people to support me, which I never had before.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you ever have any experience with overdoses, or people that had?

ANGIE. Well, I knew a lot of people that shot up, but I had never done it, and I knew somebody that died from it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Have you got any suggestions on what society can do a better job of, either the law enforcement agencies or the public in general to try and alert young people about the dangers that they are exposed to?

ANGIE. Well, I know one thing. I am on a committee which is the Youth Advisory Board for the Alaska Council on Prevention of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and we have been setting up programs to get across the impact of drugs to young people.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Why did you decide to come here today?

ANGIE. Because I figured if I could help one person it would be worth it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And I assume that there are some people that would be critical of you being here because of your past association your attitude now is to try and what, lick the problem?

ANGIE. That was in the past, this is now, and I am taking day by day.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good. What are you going to do when you finish? Are you through with high school, or have you got 1 more year?

ANGIE. Well, because of all my using in school, and everything, I flunked most of my years, so I now go to the adult learning center,

which I will go to for 4 months, and then I will graduate with my high school diploma.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good. And what are you going to do then?

ANGIE. I am going to go to college.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Great. Thanks very much. I appreciate your testimony

Jim, do you want to comment on some of your experiences, and any recommendations you would care to make, we would appreciate.

JIM. I will give a little of my background. I was raised, I guess, in a middle-class family. Did not start doing drugs or alcohol until about the age of 20 when I entered the Marine Corps. At that time, let me back up a little bit. I considered myself at that time a searcher.

In other words, I experienced everything that I possibly could, for whatever knowledge I could possibly gain, so what I started off with was—I think, I started shooting cocaine at first, a couple of times. Went to mescaline, went to speed, went to acid, and then got addicted to heroin in the end.

Got an undesirable discharge from the Marine Corps for some thefts, drug abuse, selling drugs, and what not. Got out, was still hooked on speed, and got married, was on drugs.

My first wife did not know about it. The marriage did not—it lasted for 7 or 8 years, and in that time I was drinking and doing drugs, and eventually she left, and I went crazy and started doing more drugs on top of what I was doing.

Eventually went down to California to, you know, get back with my first wife, got drunk, committed a burglary, and did a little under 3 years in the pententiaries down there. When I got out I was pretty angry, and held on—drank a little bit. I did not do any drugs for about 2 years, mainly out of fear. That was a good motivator. But eventually started going back into it.

The home—the marriage that I was involved in was not—I was not coping with it at all, and I was starting to get more frustrated, more angry.

In 1981 I started free basing a lot of cocaine, and started doing some crimes to pay for the cocaine, and attempted suicide. I went into cocaine psychosis, thought I was dying, and threw myself in front of a line of cars, ended up in a hospital, and they said I needed treatment, and I agreed, and went into treatment.

While in treatment I was also convicted of four more felonies, some of the crimes I had committed for doing cocaine. So that is basically it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What do you figure, when you were a heavy user of cocaine, what did it cost you a week?

JIM. It cost me, when I was free basing, I was doing close to $1,500 a day.

Senator MURKOWSKI. $1,500 a day?

JIM. Right.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And you had to have cash?

JIM. Not all of the time.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And most of the generation of cash came from?

JIM. From crimes, usually crimes, or else I would rip off the person that had the cocaine, either way.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did I understand you to say your first experience with drugs was in the Marine Corps?

JIM. Was in the Marine Corps, yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What year was that, roughly?

JIM. It was 1971.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Was there, at that time, drug availability in the Marine Corps?

JIM. Quite a bit, yes. You could get anything, any time, just about anywhere.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And what was the Marine Corps' attitude to, you say you got a dishonorable discharge? Did they make any rehabilitation effort, or just kick you out?

JIM. I got an undesirable discharge. They attempted to, before they did that, to, you know, they had me go see, I think it was a drug counselor, but I never went. They did not enforce it too much.

Another thing, at that time the heroin was being flown in from Southeast Asia. I was in the air wing of the Marine Corps, and a lot of the heroin that came in was pure and free, at least for me.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you come to Alaska after your experience with the Marine Corps?

JIM. Well, I was born in Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You were born in Alaska, so you—went out, so afterwards you just—came back.

JIM. Came back.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And so, is most of your drug history here in Alaska, when you were utilizing cocaine heavily?

JIM. Yes; as far as the cocaine goes. Right.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Where did you buy your drugs, on the streets?

JIM. No; I did not. I used to be a bouncer at a bar in town, and the people—they came in there, it is real easy once you are doing a certain type of drug, to pick up what that, what a person is acting like, or as far as——

Senator MURKOWSKI. In other words, you know where to go?

JIM. Soliciting cocaine, or whatever, you can tell they are a little bit hyper. In that particular bar it was real easy to pick it out. You would just initiate a conversation, and——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yes.

JIM [continuing]. And you got the drugs.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you ever sell drugs, yourself?

JIM. Not in a big way, no. Like a gram or two.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yes.

JIM. I usually used it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you tell us a little bit about what you are experiencing now, Jim, in the Akeela House?

JIM. Well, I am a substance abuse counselor there.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Akeela House, excuse me.

JIM. Yes. Akeela House. Right. I finished treatment. In regards to what the——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, what have they done for you, you know? Is it working, and is it going to work, or——

JIM. Yes, I think it is going to work. It is working now.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How long have you been off drugs?

JIM. For over 4 years. The thing I learned the most was seeing something worthwhile in—within myself, and starting with that, and express it. That is the biggest thing I have learned.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Have you got an opinion about the State law that—concerning the personal use of 4 ounces of marijuana in the home, one way or another? Is it—do you——

JIM. My personal——

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. Think it does anything?

JIM. Yes. My personal opinion is it sounds like a contradiction, at least as far as treatmentwise. I am personally not OK with that law; no.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You do not favor it then?

JIM. I do not favor it; no. I think it adds to the problem.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any idea, in the years you were exposed to drugs in Alaska, where you think the drugs are coming in from? Or is it just prevalent, it really did not dawn on you?

JIM. The heroin was coming from Mexico, the cocaine was coming from Peru and Brazil.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How do you figure it got in?

JIM. By boat.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, people carrying it, or shipped by mail, or do you know?

JIM. By boat.

Senator MURKOWSKI. By boat? Small boats coming in?

JIM. I have heard, boats, right. Ships.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What, into small ports in Alaska?

JIM. I do not know if they were small ports, or what, but——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you note, when you were buying narcotics, that there was evidence of an organized, very efficient distribution program at the top? Or was it just kind of a haphazard, unorganized—in the sense of organized crime, as we understand it to be?

JIM. Most of it was haphazard, I thought. There was only one person that I ran into once that I thought—well, he tried to set up something with me as a vast amount of kilograms, and luckily I said no. That he seemed to have, or was trying to start something up.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How can you reach the younger people? We are obviously going to have people exposed in the community, at a young age, when they do not know the damage that drugs can do, when the experimentation occurs. How can you get through to them? Have you got any ideas?

JIM. That is tough. The thing that I would recommend, and specifically in the schools, would be, and it might be being done, I do not know, but I would recommend an identification, pick up from the behavior immediately, and start having some type of program initiated within the school to help these people out.

I do not get the sense, you know, I have talked to the schools sometimes. I do not get the sense that they are really focused on that area, on that problem. And then, you know, they are saying that they run into the problems with the parents, you know, how

much is, you know, interfering with the family life, do the parents want that or not. It is a problem.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you think the drug situation is getting worse or better?

JIM. Worse.

Senator MURKOWSKI. In Alaska, worse?

JIM. In Alaska. I think it is becoming progressively worse.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What has to happen in order for it to start getting better? Does it have to get so bad that there is going to be a terrible reaction?

JIM. I think in a sense that is true. Also, I, having gone through the Department of Corrections systems, and the court systems, and talking to exfelons myself, I do not think that the law enforcement people have all the leeway that they need with dealing with the drug trafficking, or the people doing the drugs, and infringing upon the law. I sometimes cringe at it myself.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You mentioned that you felt that there should be some way to observe people who are on drugs, and I assume someone who is trained can spot them, or pick them out, is that generally correct?

JIM. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And then try and approach them, and help them at that stage, is that right?

JIM. Yes

Senator MURKOWSKI. And is there any facility or capability in Alaska, that you know of, that is doing that? If you were going to do it in school, would you need somebody trained to be able to spot these young people?

JIM. Yes; I think so.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Who are abusing drugs?

JIM. Right.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How do you divide between the personal assurance that, you know, you are not going to be harassed in the sense of individual lifestyle, and say what we see going on within our, well, it is being kicked around in baseball, whether players should be required to take, or make a mandatory or voluntary test, as to whether they have drugs in their system. And the question is a constitutional right, and we see this expressed in other areas. Some corporations are requiring some of their personnel to take tests every so often, they take random samples.

Do you think that is fair, or unfair, good or bad?

JIM. That is a tough one, because from what I have seen on TV, they are having a lot of controversy over that. My personal opinion is that if the destructiveness to the community or to the society outweighs whatever interference that you may have with the family, I say go ahead and do it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would you not get the same kind of a reaction, though, in the sense of say, young people, say you had somebody—people trained to observe those that appear to be on drugs, and you take them into a type of counseling, and they tell you to go mind your own business—I guess that you just have to go mind your own business?

JIM. I would not. I would keep trying to talk to them, or talking to them if at all possible. There are some that will not listen, that is true.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any suggestions on what the Federal Government could do a better job of in trying to prevent the spread of drug abuse?

JIM. No. 1, awareness of the problem. I think that is starting. That is happening, though. I wonder about the funding, if the Federal Government is actually, giving enough money to the programs that they are doing what they need to be doing. That seems to be a problem. And expand the programs that are now in use to help facilitate some prevention and education measures.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you think Alaska is different than any other area as far as drug abuse is concerned?

JIM. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Makes it more of a problem up here than any place else?

JIM. Yes, I do. I think if you take a look at the population that is up here, a lot of them are from the lower 48. They do not have the roots, they do not have the family support. I think part of it is the climate, believe it or not.

Part of it is the, I guess you would call it the frontier mentality that, come up here, you work real hard and, you know, you drink with two fists, and now, of course, it is drugs, you know, do drugs. You are making the money, it is OK.

It is what Alaska has acquired as a lifestyle, the drinking and the drugs is now OK.

And the main thing, I think, you have a lot of transients, a transient population, that has been uprooted, and I think that you do not have that support, you know, from your extended family, and what not.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You have observed a lot of drug usage.

JIM. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you make a general rule to what happens over a period of time? Can a person just take drugs and handle it in moderation, hard drugs, or do you eventually come under the pressure of trying to generate enough money, and get in trouble? I mean, is there any way that this thing can work out all right?

JIM. If a person is taking drugs?

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yeah, heavy drugs.

JIM. Heavy drugs? I do not think so. I think eventually it ends up in death or jail.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Or you get off them. In other words, you go to one extreme. You take care of it.

JIM. Jail, or you recover. One of the two, or three.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So you say that is about the extent of the choices?

JIM. That is what I see.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And you do not really know of any other alternative, you either cure yourself, or you get in more trouble?

JIM. Yes, that is what I have seen.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you know anything about designer drugs?

JIM. No, I do not. I just saw a segment on—I forget what channel it was, and I think I read something. It does not look good, from what I understand.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yes, I have not been able to get an awful lot of information, other than they are being developed, and they have a high potency, and when they get into the cocaine market, I understand it is very difficult. An addict cannot tell whether he is taking a designer drug or the pure cocaine, and overdosage is a real problem. But you wonder, since a sophisticated chemist can evidently make it with $400 or $500 worth of equipment if it is likely to spread into the drug scene and make things worse, or more prevalent, or cheaper or whatever, but you have not seen much of that up here?

JIM. Have not heard of anybody yet that has known that they have taken any designer drugs yet. I have not seen it yet.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I guess they are classified as high tech killers, and really have a potency hundreds of times stronger than the traditional drugs?

JIM. That is what I understand.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yes. I have no further questions.

Jim, do you have anything else you want to say to the Committee at this time?

JIM. Just that I think the problem is getting greater and greater, and something needs to be done, and I think quickly. The problem of not only drug trafficking, but of abuse and alcoholism in the State of Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you separate the two, alcohol and drugs, or do you carry them synonomously?

JIM. As far as treating them, we consider alcohol a drug. As far as behaviorally, I think a drug addict is more antisocial than an alcoholic.

In other words, they are in trouble with the law, and you have something else to deal with there.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I am going to move to our next witness, Dr. Steve Dashner, assistant superintendent of schools for the city of Anchorage, AK. And we appreciate your attendance and look forward to sharing your comments and observations with us, and we are most appreciative of the representation from the very important area vital to the communication process and our young people, and that is the Alaska schools.

Please proceed as you see fit, Dr. Dashner.

STATEMENT OF DR. STEVEN DASHNER, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, CITY OF ANCHORAGE, AK

Dr. DASHNER. Thank you, and good morning. First of all, I would like to apologize for the superintendent. He happens to be in hearings today under deposition, or he would be here in my place.

I am Steven Dashner, deputy superintendent. The Anchorage School District welcomes the opportunity to provide input regarding drug and alcohol abuse, especially the effect on students.

The district appreciates Senator Murkowski and the members of the committee reviewing this matter, and looks forward to potential solutions that may benefit the Anchorage community, and

schools in specific. The district considers itself very responsive in this matter and will provide any assistance that will help alleviate the drug and alcohol problems facing this community.

The past several years have seen major demographic changes in the Anchorage community and students As an example, the district gained over 5,500 students between 1980 and its present population of 43,000. This represents a 14.5-percent increase in Anchorage student population. Over 25 percent of Anchorage School District students will enroll or change school locations during any given year. The number of single family homes has dramatically increased.

The Anchorage community is becoming international in perspective. There are 106 languages and dialects spoken in the Anchorage School District. The district alone provides tutoring services for 53 of these languages through the bilingual education program. Most of the students served are Korean, Alaska Native, Filipino, Spanish and Japanese.

The trafficking of drugs reaches the community through sources from the Far East to South America, as has been indicated.

The drug survey you mentioned earlier was conducted on a sample of secondary students in 1982. The study shows that most students, 90 percent, do not have problems at school related to drug, alcohol usage; and relatively few students, 10 percent, feel that drug usage is a serious problem in their schools. This may indicate that primary usage of controlled substances by school age persons take place outside the school walls.

The study's conclusions state that there is a drug and alcohol experimentation and usage taking place among the school age population in Anchorage. Substances other than alcohol, tobacco and marijuana are used by 10 percent or less of the secondary aged population with any degree of regularity. Marijuana and tobacco appear to be regularly used by about one quarter of the secondary population. Alcohol is the most frequently used controlled substance, being used with some regularity by 44 percent of the group.

Experimentation is more prevalent than regular usage with approximately twice the number of students reported having ever tried a substance as compared to the number who report using it on a monthly or more frequent basis.

Comparison of Anchorage use patterns with those of the national sample of 12th grade students shows the local youngsters are more frequent users of controlled substances. The major difference appears with cocaine, where 36 percent of the local seniors indicated some usage of cocaine as compared to 12 percent of the national group.

The district is planning another drug and alcohol survey during 1986, which should update the data for 1982.

The board of education policy is one of the most stringent policies found anywhere. The policy begins as follows: A student who trades, buys, uses or possesses intoxicating liquor, illegal drugs, substances designed to look like illegal drugs, or substances purported to be illegal drugs, while under the jurisdiction of the school will be suspended. District administores actively enforce this policy. A first offense results in the automatic 7-day suspension. A second

offense results in a 45-day suspension, or the remainder of the semester, whichever is greater. A third offense results in expulsion.

In 1984–85, 606 students were suspended from school for drug/alcohol offenses. Of these, 6 were expelled, 111 were suspended and placed in the in-school suspension program for 45 days, and 489 were given 7-day suspensions to the in-school suspension program.

The in-school suspension program was developed by the school district to give students who have violated district drug policy a chance to stay in school and off the streets. It does basically four things: Places the students in a highly supervised program at Woodland Park, provides direct instructions in the courses to make sure the students stay up, provides training in the harmful effects of drug and methods of resisting peer pressure, and provides counseling and support to solve the underlying problems, which are often causes of drug abuse

We also, within our curriculum, have what we call the drug and alcohol curriculum called Here's Looking at You. This provides over 90 hours of instruction in grades K through 6 regarding drug and alcohol abuse, and over 20 hours through the health curriculum in the junior high schools. The curriculum is designed to develop in the learner responsible decisionmaking skills related to the use of drugs, including alcohol. These skills are attained within the four major curricula components of coping, decisionmaking, self-image and information.

Also, the Anchorage School District provides teachers to a number of programs that are run by special organizations. ARCH was mentioned earlier. We provide a teacher to that program. Another program as an example is Charter North Hospital, which has provided services to 53 students, 40 between January and June. Basically student will enroll themselves in Charter North for 3 weeks. Most of these students are 9th and 10th graders.

Other programs that deal with it, Rabbit Creek, Booth. As mentioned earlier, we also supply the education for McLaughlin. We also have in-school programs. The Anchorage School District basically has support groups to help students avoid future problems, are provided in all our secondary schools. As an example, Diamond High School has a student assistance program that identifies students whose lives are impacted by the use of—the abuse of drugs and alcohol. Options include in-house counseling, groups, counseling through an outside agency, or assistance into a program like Dramady, a program for therapy through drama, which has met with great success. The students have an opportunity to role play through a number of things, and are highly directed.

Another program, the last program I would like to mention, that has shown very great success, it has been in pilot 1 year. And that is our police/school liaison program. The Anchorage Police Department, in cooperation with our district, has placed a police officer in one of our junior high schools. The officer provided individual counseling to students, as well as group instruction to elementary and secondary students regarding the law and chemical abuse issues. During last year this police officer counseled over 60 individual students in addition to providing 92 group presentations at elementary, junior high and senior high schools. Nearly 4,000 students were shown the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse during last year

through this program. Expansion of this program is a district desire, but is limited by available resources.

In summary, the Anchorage School District strives to actively address the problem of drugs and alcohol abuse by our students. The district encourages Senator Murkowski's office to keep it apprised of any programs or solutions that are a result of the hearings. The district believes it provides adequate program and support in this area, but endeavors to continually improve programs that prevent student drug and alcohol abuse. The district appreciates the opportunity to provide this testimony, and looks forward to continuing dialog.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Dr. Dashner. Do you have any knowledge of whether or not within the district you have the trained people that upon the report of a teacher who indicates that through an observation a young person might be suspected of drugs, is there a procedure or process that is started at this point?

Dr. DASHNER. Yes, there is, Senator. I guess the people that probably within the school system that have the greatest knowledge base are our school nurses.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And they have the training?

Dr. DASHNER. They have been provided some training in looking at that. Also, our administrators probably do not have the training the school nurses do, but are provided some training in what to look for, those kinds of things

Senator MURKOWSKI. Who provides the training?

Dr. DASHNER. Outside organizations, for the State, for people that are versed in this, police department, State department people, to provide this type of training.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I wonder if you would, for the record, identify the sources of training that are available so they might be shared with other districts throughout the State, because it would seem that there is some justification to consider the merits of, for example, in teacher indoctrination, is it possible that somebody would address the teachers on what to do, or the procedure, or how you identify, and then where does a school nurse get the training, or is that just part of her professional training?

Dr. DASHNER. I think it comes from a combination, and I will have to defer and get you the specifics on the number. We use a number of different people and organizations to train nurses, and I will not be able to come up today with those.

I do know the nurses, through our supervisor, will look to the municipality, to the State, to people that are expert in these areas to assist in in-services, and we periodically have those in-services. I would certainly agree that there is a bit of knowledge gained through their course curriculum that they take as nurses. So I guess in summary it is the State department, the municipality, the police provide us in-services periodically in these areas for identification, for assistance, and those kinds of things. Specifically, I will have to get those names to you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. We appreciate it, because I gather from your testimony there is an orderly process that is already established within the schools where upon observation by a teacher there is a referral and subsequent reaction from trained individuals who start the process of identification and—tell me, in your

experience, what happens in the sense the teacher advises that a young person is suspected of using drugs? At that point can you walk us through, say the freshman history teacher, if she walked down the hall, does she fill out a report? What happens?

Dr. DASHNER. Yes, let me give you some examples, if I might, and we will take the case you indicated. A teacher may be walking down the hall, observe an exchange of some substance, say between two students, or note a behavior in a student that may be irrational. That usually is first reported to two individuals, an administrator and the school nurse. The administrator basically will then call the student down. They usually have, in most cases, the student nurse available, question the student regarding, what is going, you know, why the behavior, or whatever this was defined. If it is found that indeed the student is under the influence, the administrator will contact the parent, that student will be suspended, if that is the first offense, and I went through those kinds of things.

What we also try to do to help out is get those students into our in-district suspension program, which has been very beneficial. In fact, we have only had 23 repeats in that program this last year. And from talking, we got a very good evaluation on that, there are four teachers over there, a counseling program, we have had excellent success with that. So they go into that particular program while they are out of school.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is there a particular pattern among students who abuse drugs, or is it just a random, is it, we have heard, I think the thing that struck me, in Angie's testimony, was to be part of the crowd?

Dr. DASHNER. I believe, Senator, that has probably struck upon the key, and I think that is what we find in the school business to be the greatest thing facing us, is the peer pressure. I think that probably constitutes that first time more than anything else, is the peer, "I want to try it. I want to experiment with it," that starts them on that avenue.

I think that is one of the reasons that we spend a lot of time in the curriculum in the early ages, as I defined, of trying to get the students to deal with those coping skills, and I think we are having some success with some of the programs, and only lately, of doing the things that Angie mentioned and that is building peer pressure groups that learn how to cope.

One of the things that often happens in our education is as educators we spend a lot of time, practice, practice, practice seems to be the word, but we do not put students into the practice environment of dealing with peer pressure. "What happens if? How do we deal with this when I am confronted this way?" And some of the successful programs are the ones that try to get those students into drama, role playing, coping, that will set them up so when faced with that they have something to draw on that may indeed help them deal with this particular pressure, whether it be personal, family or peer.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How long, Dr. Dashner, have you been in your capacity as assistant superintendent?

Dr. DASHNER. I have been in this capacity of deputy superintendent for 3 years. I have been in the Anchorage School District for 8 years; 4 years, I am sorry, deputy for 4 years.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So you have observed then for a significant period of time the behavioral patterns associated with drug abuse?

Dr. DASHNER. Probably not firsthand, as should. It is more secondhand, more interaction with people that come in contact. Probably very little firsthand information.

Senator MURKOWSKI. No, but from an administrative point of view, at least?

Dr. DASHNER. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Could you assess for the committee your evaluation of the current status of whether peer pressure dictates that drugs are the thing to do or not, currently?

Dr. DASHNER. Excellent question. I do not know that I have the specific answers I think, I guess I would like to say twofold. First, I would like to say yes, I think peer pressure has a great influence. And I am not too sure whether it is peer, and the second one is family. Family in Alaska, Jim mentioned the families in Alaska were some of the things—of alcohol being very prevalent, and around.

I think those two factors play, at least from the people that I observe in hearings, and things like that, many times we get students, parents that oppose the suspension. So that are given due process rights. And in those hearings you hear things like, "we, I think it's OK." Or, you know, "we do it around home," or things like that. That is a hard, hard thing to overcome, when indeed your parents are providing it, or even maybe allowing it, and I am speaking mostly of alcohol, but those kinds of pressures, probably peer and home, are very significant

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, if you could respond to the question specifically, are drugs in or not in, currently?

Dr. DASHNER. OK, I am going to give you one statistic that is a little different than what Jim said. If it is accurate, we are getting a lessening of suspensions over the past 2 years drug related. It is not significant, but there is a decreasing in suspensions. Now, that is probably the only hard data I have. I wish we had our 1986 survey compared to 1982, that would give me the hard data. But if the suspensions, which is what I would have to go on, any hard data I have, are beginning to lessen a little bit, then there may be potentially some waning, or at least controlling, and no increase I guess would be the best way to say it, of the problem.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, I think it is fair to say that in Alaska proportionately there is a higher amount expended for rehabilitation than most other States. I think a figure of around $15 million has been used, and I know in the State of Maryland it is, $7.5 million. So proportionately, we are much higher.

But when you see a statistic like the experimentation of high school seniors of cocaine at three times the national average, you draw the conclusion of, first, at least there is significant availability, if not more so, and, you now, you cited a number of things that you were doing to combat the problem of drugs in the school, and I guess the one thing you have a hard time with is the availability. You acknowledge that they are there, in an abundance?

Dr. DASHNER. Without a doubt. I think that is probably, if you would ask me the question you asked the other two, what is the

single most significant thing that anybody could do, and that would be cut the supply.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What happens if you catch somebody selling drugs in schools? Anything different?

Dr. DASHNER. Yes. We start immediately—if selling look alikes or drugs, we do not start with the 7 day, we go immediately to the 45 or semester, which ever is longer, so we start the second process immediately if somebody we find is selling.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have detailed records for public consumption on some historical data on trends? In other words, I think you indicated 605——

Mr. DASHNER. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. First, how long have you been keeping this kind of a record.

Dr. DASHNER. I think we have suspension reports as long as 5 years, maybe longer. I would have to check for sure, but I know we have them for 5 years.

Senator MURKOWSKI. We would appreciate if after you review with your other authorities if you would be inclined to provide some trend material on the three specific classifications over the years of your policies, just to support or reject the question of trends.

Do you feel that the many things you are doing are supported widely by parents, or are parents critical of what the schools are doing, or disinterested? I am talking about parents who have a son or a daughter with a drug problem.

Dr. DASHNER. Most of my contacts, and interactions, the parents have been very supportive. They, as we often do, they blame themselves, are very happy the school is taking some active measures. Very supportive of the in-district programs, the in-school programs. We find most parents real supportive of those, willing to help. I say that because they are the ones that get the students to the programs. We do not provide transportation, and in practically 95 percent of the students suspended, go into that program, and the parents provide the transportation, and are very supportive of that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. We talked about this a little earlier, but is it fair to say that teachers are trained, or not trained to identify students using drugs?

Dr. DASHNER. I do not believe teachers are trained to identify students.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you feel that they should be?

Dr. DASHNER. I have to think about that. I guess you must understand this, and this is probably my individual preference, I think society is placing a lot on our public education system. Everytime something turns around they say, "well, let's train our public teachers, administrators, to deal with sex abuse, drug and alcohol," on and on. And our No. 1 job is the education, teaching the basics, teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, if you will. I think they can help. I do not know how much training one needs to be able to become proficient to identify the difference between a student that stayed up all night studying versus one that may be under the influence, so I guess I weigh that judgment very carefully, because I believe fully that our No. 1 job is the education of all of our students, to the best of our ability. And sometimes to bring on a lot of

other programs, those have to be carefully weighed in reflection to that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. When the teachers professionally discuss the problem, which I am sure they do, do they have any consensus as to what their role should be?

Dr. DASHNER. I think most teachers are concerned about kids. That concern carries over to helping the students any way they can, to improve their education. That means to them, you know, if they are under influence, if they are partaking, the teachers will do what they can to probably eliminate that. I believe most teachers view it that way

Senator MURKOWSKI. You are satisfied that at least in this district that is is just not something that is overlooked in cases because of the difficulty in addressing?

Dr. DASHNER. No, sir, I believe that we are as concerned as many other people, and, you know, we actively, as I indicated, look for any programs that may help. We have a number of programs, as I mentioned, that we had initiated, and are quite successful, within the resources that we have.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You indicated that there is a high degree of transient activity in the school district, which I think is true probably of major parts of Alaska as well, and you have a relatively large international mix.

What makes it harder in Alaska, in your opinion? Is it, in your opinion, necessarily harder to combat the threat of drugs among people of school age?

Dr. DASHNER. I think some of the things that Jim mentioned, I think climate, I think family. I think we live in Anchorage, and I will speak to Anchorage, and compared to the lower 48, in some affluency. That could be seen with our average salaries, and so forth. I think money, without a doubt, brings the ability to do more things with it. I am sure that has an effect. However, and I—to be honest with you, I came from the inner city, St. Louis, before I came to Alaska, and some similar problems existed in the inner city of St. Louis, as exist here. When it is available, people can get to it. And the problems do exist.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would it be appropriate to try stricter measures to keep drugs out of school, in the sense of, you know, there are sniffing dogs, trained dogs, there are other methods that generally infringe upon individual rights, which has always been a concern, but you indicated that you felt that the ability was one of your major concerns, so obviously an answer would be to take steps to try to ensure that it did not get in school, but the extremes that you would have to go to, would you encorage those to be initiated?

Dr. DASHNER. I guess my answer to that is carefully weighed. Like I think, yes, you could absolutely prevent drugs from being in the schools. I can give you a method. It would never be accepted by the public.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What is it?

Dr. DASHNER. Put fences around all the schools, check every student that comes in. Now, that, I think you and I both know, that is not an alternative that I would ever recommend. That takes away, that provides an environment not conducive to education. I happen to be familiar with some of those schools. We had some like that in

St. Louis for different reasons. And the students were checked in and checked out, high schools of 2,000, closed campuses, those kinds of things. To me, that is not conducive.

If the students feel typed, we had nine police officers that resided in one of our—in our high schools. That is not the situation you see in our high schools here in Anchorage. They are conducive to learning. Those situations were not that conducive to learning.

So yeah, there are preventative methods, and the very question you raised, you know, at what point do you take that? And as an educator, we constantly deal with those kinds of solutions versus the good of education, or the worth of education.

Senator MURKOWSKI. If you had more money, do you know what you would do with it?

Dr. DASHNER. I would probably say, yes, if we had a little more money, I think one of the programs that we have had great success with this year is this police liaison officer. And again, I caution that is a function of the individual, as you and I both know. The individual we had working this year was excellent, understood kids, understood the limits. I think that individual had a great influence on a number of kids. We have only one of those. It would be nice to have maybe five or six of those.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Does this one work the district?

Dr. DASHNER. Yes. Basically we resided that individual at one junior high, so the influence mainly was in that junior high. However, we did use that individual for group presentations in our other schools, but not any individual——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you indicate any other Federal or State assistance, I am interested obviously in Federal——

Dr. DASHNER. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. To aid the schools, teachers in combating illegal drugs specifically?

Dr. DASHNER. I think that maybe one thing, and that is, I think, at the Federal level, with exposure, and that is training. I think that the national programs at the Federal level, there may be some excellent training programs that would assist our nurses as you indicated earlier, in terms of having to deal with this and those kinds of things Training to me is the potential key.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any thoughts about Alaska's marijuana law, as to whether it contributes, or does not contribute, or is a negative on the question of youth drug abuse?

Dr. DASHNER. Oh, I am sure it has to contribute just by having the parents—I make this assumption, which may be a wrong assumption. It is available to the parents, the parents use it. The students see the parents use it, it becomes a, not a negative influence, but a positive influence, or something that is accepted. Students pick up that acceptance. We reflect the behaviors of our parents Carry that to the extremes; you see the conclusion.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So I assume then you do not support it?

Dr. DASHNER. I probably, individually, do not support, that is correct.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is it an issue that is appropriate for the educators to address professionally from the standpoint of their—they see and work with the youth, and it is a matter that would be

addressed, if it is addressed by the State legislature, so it is representative of action/reaction type of thing——

Dr. DASHNER. Well——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Has the NEA, or any of the professional organizations, ever addressed an issue like that, or is it appropriate?

Dr. DASHNER. First of all, I think it may be appropriate. I am not too sure whether the AEA addresses it or the NEA in Alaska addresses that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. But you think it is appropriate that they consider it?

Dr. DASHNER. I think it is appropriate.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Do you have any other statement you would care to make?

Dr. DASHNER. No. Appreciate the time.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I would again ask, Angie, do you have any other statements you would care to make, or any other comments?

ANGIE. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Angie.

Jim?

JIM. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Let me ask you one question. Are you aware of any waiting list in Anchorage for treatment for drug abusers? And do we have the capability to handle, as far as you know, the load that we have?

JIM. Oh, there is a waiting list. So far as the Akeela House program I work for, I think there is a waiting list. It has been up to 100 sometimes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. It is up to 100?

JIM. Or it has been there sometimes. I do not know what it is right now. That is because we receive a lot of the department of corrections people.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you know within the school system, Doctor, whether there is a waiting list to try and seek rehabilitation for some of those young people that need it?

Dr. DASHNER. Senator, I do not know.

Senator MURKOWSKI. OK.

I have no further questions of the panel.

I want to thank you, Angie, particularly for your willingness to indicate some of your experiences and observations, and I think it will go a long way in furthering a message to many of the young Alaskans who are concerned about peer pressure and keeping up with the group.

And, Jim, thank you for indicating your experiences.

And, of course, Dr. Dashner, I want to commend you and the superintendent of schools and your associates for your committed efforts to try and respond to this growing concern that we all have. And I think by sharing information and getting a better understanding that we can, perhaps, more effectively address the problem before us.

It is not one to put a spotlight on anything or anybody. It is a realization that, I think, is uniform throughout our Nation. We only respond to a situation when it seems to get out of hand. And I guess the question we have to ask ourselves is is it getting worse in our State? Is it getting out of hand? And, if so, are we prepared to

make the necessary commitment, not only in money and materials, but in a dedicated effort to reduce the exposure, and hopefully this hearing will play some role in that process, so I commend you all.

We will take a 3½-minute recess while we clear this panel and prepare for the next panel.

[Short recess].

Senator MURKOWSKI. I would like to reconvene the hearing, and would ask that people come in and be seated at their convenience.

We will now move to panel No. 2, and I would ask that the witness known as Carlos, to come into the courtroom at this time.

I might mention for the record that Carlos is a convicted Colombian narcotics trafficker presently in Federal prison. And for reasons of security, his appearance is going to be concealed. He has been brought to us by the Justice Department. He has a record of association with trafficking, or words to that effect, drugs within our State of Alaska. I would ask the witness to remain standing for a moment to take the oath.

Please rise and raise your right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes, he does.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Please be seated.

For the record, Carlos will be accompanied by David Melocik of the Drug Enforcement Administration. And in order to accommodate Carlos' limited use of English, and to conceal his voice, the communications back and forth will be through Mr. Melocik. And Mr. Melocik will speak to the Chair after conferring with the witness, Carlos.

What I would like to hear for the record initially is the history, Carlos, of your involvement with drug trafficking within our State of Alaska. If you could give us some idea of how long you were involved, specifically what your role was, and did you supervise other people, and I have other specific questions. But if you would care to initiate your testimony, it would be appreciated.

STATEMENT OF A WITNESS NAMED "CARLOS," ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID MELOCIK, DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MELOCIK. He began his drug trafficking activities here in 1979, and he continued until 1981. Then he stopped for a period of a year or two, and then he picked it up for about another year, until he was caught.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any idea of how much money exchanged hands for drugs that you personally handled in your—under your own control in that period, say from 1979 to 1981?

Mr. MELOCIK. He believes that during each month that he was active in the distribution of drugs that he supervised about 4 to 5 kilos a month coming in, and that those kilos were selling here——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is that cocaine, or heroin?

Mr. MELOCIK. Cocaine—he only handled cocaine. And that each kilo was—he was paying about $60,000, $65,000 for. So if you——

Senator MURKOWSKI. What was the street value of that, if he was paying $60,000 to $65,000 per kilo?

Mr. MELOCIK. About $200,000 it was being sold here on the street for each kilo.

Senator MURKOWSKI. That is $800,000 street value, is that not correct, if he is moving 4 or 5 kilos a month?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes; for 4, right.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So, if he was moving 5, that was $1 million a month?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, can you give us a description of, in this 2-year period, from 1979 to 1981, of how much it was marketed, say on the North Slope, how much in Fairbanks, Anchorage, the native villages, Southeastern? Can you give us a breakdown on——

Mr. MELOCIK. The organization that he was involved with, they were bringing the 4 or 5 kilos a month, and just about all of that was staying right here in Anchorage.

Now, there were other organizations, he said that were supplying the north coast up there, and Fairbanks. But almost all of his stayed right here in Anchorage.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, what is your organization? What did it consist of? What was it made up of? What was your role? And was it an organization limited here, or was it controlled outside, some place else, and if so, how was it structured, and over—the oversight process?

Mr. MELOCIK. He said he wanted to make it clear that it was not his organization, but the organization for which he worked. The drugs came to Anchorage from Los Angeles, and maybe sometimes from New York, and it is his belief that they were securing drugs from Miami.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How did the drugs physically get to Alaska?

Mr. MELOCIK. The drugs were invariably, just about 100 percent, brought by mules, people who would carry drugs, and they would just bring them in their luggage, through Anchorage Airport.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And a mule is a person who carries drugs?

Mr. MELOCIK. That is correct. He was explaining to us—he was—defined that for us a little bit yesterday. Let me see if I can go over that with him right now.

He defines as a mule three types of mules would come into Anchorage. There was the professional mule, who was a very trusted member of the organization down in Los Angeles, and this mule would bring the drugs to Anchorage, take—make the exchange of the drugs for the money, and then the drug—the money would be taken by the mule back to Los Angeles.

The second type of mule that he describes is a semiprofessional where he also knew that he had possession of the drugs, and he would bring the drugs up to Anchorage, make his deliveries, and then depart and go back to Los Angeles. He would not have anything to do with the cash.

The third type was referred to as an unwitting mule, where someone was given a trip to Alaska, and were told that they were going to bring a gift for a friend up here, and were given a wrapped box, and thinking that they had a gift, and they would bring it up and deliver it to someone here, and they would again

stay and then leave, but not know that they had delivered cocaine to Anchorage.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Tell me a little bit about the organization, Carlos. How many people were involved in Alaska in the organization. And were they just sellers, or did they do another function?

Mr. MELOCIK. All right. There were about five or six members who would—were steady—which steadily take delivery of the drugs up here in Anchorage, and then each of them would have maybe five or six working for them, in breaking down the drugs and making the deliveries. So, if you take that 5 or 6, then times 5 or another 6 here, you are talking about 30, 35 individuals in this—just this organization, that he knows about.

Senator MURKOWSKI. In this organization that Carlos was a part of, was there any concentrated effort to make drugs available to individuals who would push them to the younger population, on in the schools?

Mr. MELOCIK. He says there was a great demand already existing here in Anchorage. Distribution would be made to anyone who would buy it, and kids from high school up through the professional ranks here in Anchorage were buying and using drugs. It was, he says it was, they did not have to go out and look for customers.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, did you sell directly to students in high school, or did you sell to the pusher or go-between?

Mr. MELOCIK. He again, he wants to make clear that he did not sell any drugs. He was a supervisor of the organization up here. He would report to Los Angles that the mules had arrived with the drugs, that they had received their money, and they were back. He claimed that his role had nothing to do with the selling. He is aware that drugs were sold by the lower distributors to children in high school.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And, Carlos, I think you indicated that you only handled cocaine, is that correct? You did not handle heroin within your organization, or marijuana?

Mr. MELOCIK. Just cocaine.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Were you in competitition with other organizations that were bringing cocaine in?

Mr. MELOCIK. No; there was no competition, no fighting between the various organizations here. They cooperated, they did not try and steal each others 'customers. They thought there was enough market up here that there had—did not have to be any problems at all.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, you indicated that most of your cocaine was marketed in Anchorage, but since you indicated that there were other areas of the State covered by other dealers, or other organizations, I guess would be correct, and you did not really compete, can you give the committee any idea of how many additional kilos might have been coming into the State between that period, 1979 to 1981? You said you were bringing 4 to 5 kilos per month, your organization, most of which was consumed here in Anchorage?

Mr. MELOCIK. He does not know. He just knows that there were other parts of his organization that were bringing drugs in that he did not—was not involved with, and he does know that other orga-

nizations. He just knows that it was much more than what he was involved in was coming into Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, were you paid on a monthly basis, or as each kilo was marketed were you paid? How, as supervisor of the organization, how did you get paid, on what basis?

Mr. MELOCIK. He was based—his—the money he received was based on the number of mules that came through, that he supervised and sent back. He received no part of the funds from the resell, resale up here. His commission was sort of based on a salary from Los Angeles, and he never, he said he never received as much money as he thought he should have received. Over the 4 or 5 year period I think he said that between $30,000 and $25,000.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Per year?

Mr. MELOCIK. No; total during that time.

Senator MURKOWSKI. For the whole——

Mr. MELOCIK. He said that he thought he should have made, you know, much more, or $80,000, but that the organization just did not take care of him.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Was he paid by someone in a more authoritative position here in Alaska, or was he paid out of Los Angeles, or some other place?

Mr. MELOCIK. He was paid out of Los Angeles.

Senator MURKOWSKI. He, basically, oversaw the movement of the mules up to the State, and then did the mules turn the narcotics over to him for distribution? Or who——

Mr. MELOCIK. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. Did the mules turn the narcotics over to?

Mr. MELOCIK. All right. Again, the drugs were delivered by the mules directly to the various wholesalers. Carlos' function was to be the eyes and ears of head of the organization down in Los Angeles, and to make sure that the mules were doing their job. He kept Los Angeles apprised that the—they had delivered, they had showed up in Anchorage, they had delivered the drugs, they had the money, they were coming back. He made sure that the—that they lived according to the rules when they were here. No fast living, no getting in trouble while they were here.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How many wholesalers were in the organization that Carlos oversaw the movement of the mules to?

Mr. MELOCIK. Again, they made about five or six in the one part of the organization, that he knew about.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did those people make more money than Carlos?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yeah; much more

Senator MURKOWSKI. How much would one of the five or six individuals that were moving and distributing, say 4 or 5 kilos a month, make?

Mr. MELOCIK. It varied, depending on how they sold the drugs. If they sold the drugs as a half a pound, they would not make as much as if they broke it down to an ounce. If they sold it by the ounce, they would sell it for $25 to—$2,500 to $3,000 an ounce. So, if they sold it that way, they would make much more money.

Now, again, that money stayed here. All they had to pay was the $60,000 to $65,000 going back down to Los Angeles, so they could

charge any price they wanted here, so they could get $3,000 an ounce, then they are making, you know, a good bit of money.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, did they know of your existence. Did you know the wholesalers, and did the wholesalers know you? Or did you just know the mules?

Mr. MELOCIK. He said he knew mostly just the mules, and dealt with them.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you feel that the mules that were coming up were a part of an organized criminal group in the sense of having significant control of a large amount of drugs coming into the United States, and that you were just a small cog in the wheel of distribution?

Mr. MELOCIK. He does believe he was a small cog in this organization, and the way that the organization was set up and his contacts in Los Angeles, they kept him in the dark as to what their other activities were. He had suspicion that they were involved in other places, but his only knowledge was up here in Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, can you give us some background on how they first made contact with you, and why you agreed to oversee the organization of the mules coming into Alaska?

Mr. MELOCIK. He does not want to answer that question.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Were you under any threats from the organization down below if you did not keep your mouth shut, or at any time was there any standing threats to you as an individual?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, sir; he never thought that he was under a threat from the organization at all.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did you have any type of weapon, or keep any kind of a weapon, a gun or anything else in your general activities in representing and observing the mules, or in your general employment, did you have a gun?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, sir; he says he has never had a weapon, except when he was in the Army.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, do you feel that organized crime is involved in drug trafficking in Alaska? Outside the State of Alaska?

Mr. MELOCIK. He does not believe organized crime, in a traditional sense. He says there was no mass killing off, or fighting between organizations or large violent group. It was organized to the extent that they certainly had a system of getting drugs from Miami and New York to Los Angeles. They had a system of bring it here, but in the sense of organized crime meaning a violent group, no, he does not believe so.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I was referring specifically to the violence that we know about in Miami, say in the—movement of drugs.

Mr. MELOCIK. He said no, that he did not believe there was that—the threat of violence in his organization at all.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How did you avoid, Carlos, detection and arrest while you were overseeing the movement of the mules? Certainly there could have been an undercover mule that would have known of your existence, or were you not concerned about detection?

Mr. MELOCIK. The mules never knew his real name, and the mules were constantly varied, so it was not the same mules who were coming through all the time. All of their communications

that Carlos had with Los Angeles when he ordered the drugs, or when he called back to report as to what was happening, was all done through pay phones, from pay phone to pay phone. From pay phone here to a pay phone in Los Angeles. Coins were used to pay, there was no charging of the phone calls, no reversing the charges, and all communication was dealt in that way, and so they took what necessary precautions they thought, and it served them well.

Senator MURKOWSKI. OK. When you were observing, I guess the mule coming to Alaska, and then turning over the drug to the wholesaler, did you ever have an occasion where a mule did not turn it over? And then I assume your job was to notify the organization in Los Angeles, or wherever. And then what would happen to that mule?

Mr. MELOCIK. He said that never happened in his experience.

Senator MURKOWSKI. All the mules delivered then?

Mr. MELOCIK. In addition to his overseeing of the mules, while they were here, unbeknownst to the mules, other members of the organization came up with the mule in the same plane, and watched the mule also. So the mule was under constant surveillance all the time that he was here and went back. So many precautions were taken on the mules and the——

Senator MURKOWSKI. How many mules would come up in a week, on an average?

Mr. MELOCIK. He said it was never a steady flow. There was never a scheduled delivery every week. One week there might be no one coming in, the next week they might bring the 3 or 4 kilos in by three or four mules, and then it would depend on, you know, the orders going back to Los Angeles, another one would come, but——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would they bring the cocaine on their person, or would it be in their luggage, and which airline would they travel up on.

Mr. MELOCIK. It was never steady. He said they would take any airline up here. And he says that there was never any concealment, other than putting it in their luggage. They did not, no swallowing it, nobody carrying it. The luggage was fine, no problems.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And there was never an occasion when there was any luggage, or does Carlos have any knowledge of when there was a pickup of narcotics coming in by the authorities who may have had a dog in the baggage room or something? Has he any knowledge of any case where there was a pickup of a shipment by the authorities, or one was not delivered in the luggage?

Mr. MELOCIK. He was—none of his shipments were ever intercepted. He is not aware that they used dogs. He says in other localities, such as New York, they worry about the dogs, and the—he said although the organization has ways to get around dogs, but they were worried about the computers, and the surveillance in other cities, but in Anchorage they never had a problem, and it was considered just a normal thing, just put it in your luggage, and bring it here. No problems.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did the mules know they were bringing narcotics in their luggage?

Mr. MELOCIK. There again, there were three types of mules.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I know, but most of them?

Mr. MELOCIK. The first two—most of them did.

Senator MURKOWSKI. They were knowledgeable of what they were carrying?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How many mules a month, Carlos, would you say were coming in during that period of time?

Mr. MELOCIK. He said again it depended on the business. Some weeks there would be none, another week there would be four or five, but he said it depended on the business.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I am just trying to get some knowledge of what the volume might be in a year.

Mr. MELOCIK. He said like—that they could send two kilos with one mule like on a Monday, and then on Wednesday another mule would come up with 2 kilos, and he says then that could be it for the month.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How many kilos would he bring in maybe in a year? I think we talked about 4 to 5 kilos per month. I guess you could figure——

Mr. MELOCIK. That is——

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. That out for youself. Was there any, did Carlos—do you know of any variation in prices, was there significant, or did you have knowledge, any knowledge, of the price, since you were not part of the sales process?

Mr. MELOCIK. The kilo that would be bought here in Anchorage for $60,000 would on the average cost about $70,000 up in Prudhoe Bay.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You did not feel then that you in your position had to take any precautions? You were primarily an observer? Did you observe the mules at the airport coming in? In other words, did you go out to the airport and watch, hang around the baggage? Or how did you make your observations?

Mr. MELOCIK. He would know how the mules were supposed to be dressed, what flights they were coming in, so yes, he would go to the airport, and he would follow them to where they were supposed to go.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And they were not aware that he was following them?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, nor were they aware that there were other people who were also following them.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So would Carlos, would you get in the car and then follow them to wherever they were going, or did you already know where they were going?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes, sometimes he did. Sometimes he knew where they were going, sometimes he did not. But he would follow them to where they were going.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And then he would make a report to Los Angeles that they had gotten to their destination.

Mr. MELOCIK. He would know what hotel they were—would go to, so he would go to that hotel and watch them come in, observe, you know, if they did not come out, or he would go check and see what was wrong.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Did most of the mules travel first class or tourist?

Mr. MELOCIK. He says they travel first class, and they loved it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, that is an observation we could all keep in mind, I guess. Is it, in your opinion, easy to bring drugs into Alaska, particularly cocaine?

Mr. MELOCIK. It is really, really easy.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you tell us the circumstances on how you were arrested?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, sir, he does not want to talk about that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. It is fair for the record to observe that he was apprehended?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, can you indicate, based on your experience, up until the time of your apprehension, of what you think Alaska can look toward as far as either a decline in drugs coming in or an increase? Is it likely to continue to be very attractive for drug dealers to move drugs in Alaska? Do you expect Colombian drug traffic to come into Alaska from Miami as opposed to what you were familiar with in Los Angeles?

Mr. MELOCIK. He believes that certainly other than Colombia, there are other sources for the drugs in Peru and Bolivia. That they do not—they would not bring the drugs directly here to Alaska, but they would bring them through the United States, and mostly, originally through Miami. But he cannot understand why there has not been more organizations up here in Alaska. It is such a good market. You can sell the cocaine for much more up here than you can get for it in the lower 48. That you can see the drugs, what they get $60,000 for here, they are only getting maybe $35,000 to $40,000, so you can bring less drugs here, sell it for more money, very easy to get it in, good incomes up here. A lot of—everybody uses it, that, yes, he would expect that more drugs would be coming into Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos says everybody uses it. Who is "everybody"?

Mr. MELOCIK. When he says everybody, he means all types of people. The young people, the old people, professional people, females, males. He says he has seen all type of people using drugs here.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, now that you have been apprehended, do you have any opinions on what the Federal Government should do to curb the expansion of narcotics, particularly in Alaska?

Mr. MELOCIK. Senator, he says that on the prevention ads that he sees on television, he never sees anything that the Government shows how people get entrapped into using drugs, or to selling drugs, that if they knew—he says if he knew the whole story about drugs, and what happens to people, he would have never gotten involved, and he does not feel that the message comes across to people, what the whole organization involves in drug trafficking, how the big shots, how they are living with their money, what happens to the people who use it. He does not see that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you think, Carlos, that the courts should provide heavier penalties for those who are responsible ultimately for the production of vast amounts of drugs? Do you favor capital punishment for those people. Obviously your share was very minor

as far as what you made, $20,000, $25,000 in relationship to, you know, $200,000 street value per kilo?

Mr. MELOCIK. It is difficult for him to answer this. Again, he wants to talk about again what the Government could do. He says that he believes that drug trafficking was the lowest form of business to be involved in. And that he says that he thinks that the message out to be given out to people, that the message that sits out there is that it is glorified, the way they show the drug traffickers themselves, but he says really that it, in real life, it is the lowest form of, and he uses a different word, the lowest form of vocation to be involved in.

Senator MURKOWSKI. But it is very profitable?

Mr. MELOCIK. Very profitable.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So that is why. They make a lot of money.

Mr. MELOCIK. Well, again, he said he did not make a lot of money, but others certainly did.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Others do.

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes, he said the big people made the money.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Does he think the big people should receive stiffer penalties?

Mr. MELOCIK. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Does he support capital punishment for the big people?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, he does not know.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, why are you here today?

Mr. MELOCIK. He is very adamant on this point. He wants to get the message across that the lower people in the organizations which, and these organizations cannot exist without these people, do not make that amount of money. The money goes to the big people, who live the wild life, but the organization depends on little people, who are not making that kind of money. He believes that it destroys the family. It destroys lives, and that is why he said he wanted to come here and give that message. He said that he has been in various prisons during—hile serving his sentence, and he says the men without their wives, without their children, and how their lives—their lives have been destroyed. So it is not only the victims who are taking the drugs, but these people, who serve in these organizations, they destroyed their lives and families

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, have you received any assurance of favors from the Department of Justice for coming here to testify?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, sir; he has received nothing.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I have no further questions for you, Carlos. Do you have anything you would like to add for the record?

Mr. MELOCIK. Again, he would hope that the message would come out of Washington that somehow they could convince people that—do not go into the drug business, that it—there is nothing there for you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you for your testimony, Carlos. We are appreciative. We understand your reason for not answering some of the questions. I hope that your message which you have given to us is one that is communicated to those who might contemplate involving themselves in trafficking of drugs, and I think particularly the knowledge that your role was not highly paid. You indicated, I believe, $25,000 for the period of time.

Did you have any other means of support during that period of time, other than overseeing the mules for the organization, because it is hard to conceive that you could live for 2 years on $25,000 in Alaska.

Mr. MELOCIK. He did have other employment here. He does not want to talk about what that other employment was. But the money that he did receive, the $20,000 to $25,000, he considered was after expenses, but he did have other employment here in Anchorage.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I assume he had no high expenses as far as paying off any groups or individuals?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, he had no major——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Does have any knowldge of any particular ethnic groups that may have from time to time come into various areas of Alaska, particularly the smaller communities, some of the native communities, take jobs as taxi drivers, to peddle drugs, and then leave after a short period of time?

Mr. MELOCIK. No, sir, he is not aware of any such activity.

Sunator Murkowski And lastly, does Carlos have any comments on how the danger of drugs can be brought to the attention of young people, so that they are aware of the exposures?

Mr. MELOCIK. He believes that the education in the school systems, he does not believe it is as effective for the teachers to talk to the children, and try to explain drug use to them, because he does not believe a lot of them have any experience in it, who have never really seen the problems that it causes. That if a person who has been involved in the business, such as he has, or law enforcement personnel, if they went into the schools and who were—that it would be seen by the children as a much more reliable person, a person who could be believed, if they would—could tell the children, he believes—it is his opinion, that that would be more effective.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, Mr. Melocik, is there a provision—you with the Drug Enforcement Administration, I assume are working on all aspects of reaction to something that might be positive in trying to get the story across. Is there provisions for witnesses such as Carlos to appear? Or is it very difficult to ensure their security? Or how do you take Carlos' message, and through your responsibility——

Mr. MELOCIK. The Drug Enforcement Administration is primarily, as it says, an enforcement organization. There are other organizations within the Government, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, that are much more involved in rehabilitation, treatment, and prevention.

The Drug Enforcement Administration is involved in a national program with the National Association of High School Coaches, the National Football League Players Association, the National Football League itself, in which we are using—trying to establish a program using professional athletes, the high school coaches in building a program in the—through the coaches in the high schools to bring peer pressure from the athletic teams, getting the athletes who are sometimes looked up to in the high school, to being—to agree that they will not use drugs, and that they will bring peer pressure on their associates in high school to not use drugs.

This program has been effect for just about several months. I cannot tell you what the results of that are yet, but again, coaches usually build a very close relationship with the boys. The boys have a lot of respect for their coaches, it is a father figure in some sense. In some sense he can have a better communication with the boys. And hopefully we are using that through the National Football League, the National Football League Players Association, have been very active. Baseball is starting such a program. We are going to see if that works. So we are active in that way, but would DEA agents be available to go into the schools?

No, sir, we are—we do not have that kind of resources to do that. We rarely even speak now at public gatherings.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You put a lot of emphasis on what you are doing for men. What are you doing for women?

Mr. MELOCIK. Well, I should not have used that. The high school coaches also coach females also. The basketball teams. Yes, I am very sorry.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Carlos, do you think you would be effective in—if you told your story to a high school senior class, and would you be willing to do it, if your security could be assured?

Mr. MELOCIK. He would love to do that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And, Mr. Melocik, you know that there is—the reason that it has not been done is because specifically——

Mr. MELOCIK. Well, with prisoners, the Drug Enforcement Administration has no control over prisoners. That is done by the Bureau of Prisons, and the U.S. Marshal Service is responsible for moving them from prison to wherever they are going, so the Drug Enforcement Administration would not be involved in that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would you recommend that an individual like Carlos to the Prison Association be available to—I mean, is this something worthy of consideration? Or is it just the logistics make it impossible.

Mr. MELOCIK. You know, again—I do not know the logistics of that. I think that could certainly be brought to the prisons as a recommendation, to see if there are people who are willing to do that as a community service. They could do it in the communities where the prison is located, they would not have to be transported, you know, across States.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, we just heard from Dr. Dashner, assistant superintendent of schools. If there is an invitation extended to Carlos, is it likely that he could accept the invitation? I am not suggesting anything exactly. I am simply throwing it out for consideration since he seems to think it would be beneficial, and I happen to feel it would certainly make an impression that those young people have not previously been exposed to.

Mr. MELOCIK. As far as he is concerned, he would welcome such an invitation; he would like to go. Now, what the Bureau of Prisons and the U.S Marshal Service would—how much involvement it would take of them, and away from their regular duties, I do not know.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, we will see. We have laid some groundwork here, and we will let the system take its course, whatever action is deemed appropriate.

I have no further questions of the witness, Carlos. I wish you well in your efforts for rehabilitation, and thank you for being with us today.

And, Mr. Melocik, I appreciate your contribution in communicating on behalf of the witness.

Thank you.

Mr. MELOCIK. You are welcome, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. We are going to move into panel 3 without a break at this time. We have three witnesses—four witnesses, excuse me, that are going to be with us. Our first witness is Dr. Robert Sundberg, Alaska Commissioner of Public Safety, who will be accompanied by Lt. Tom Stearns. And I want to thank Bob Sundberg, he has been most helpful, and Lieutenant Stearns, particularly, who I guess got stuck with some of the detail.

The final panel is made up of local and Federal law enforcement officials who are representative of hundreds of brave men and women who are in the front lines to combat illegal narcotics into our State. We look forward to the insights and scope and the impact of their testimony. And look forward to the recommendations of these law enforcement officials.

We also have Mr. Glenn Herbst, is that pretty close?

Mr. HERBST. That is correct.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Who is the police chief of Dillingham, AK.

Mr Gary Liming—is that correct, Gary?

Mr. LIMING. Liming.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Liming.

Mr. LIMING. Yes, sir.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Excuse me. Special Agent in Charge of the Seattle Field Division of the Drug Enforcement Agency, U.S. Department of Justice. And Mr. James Swartz, assistant U.S. attorney for Alaska.

Gentlemen, I appreciate you willingness to be with us today. I am sorry that we have gone on a little longer than perhaps either one of us had anticipated, but what we are attempting to do is compile a record worthy of the situation as it consists in our State today.

So with that, I would ask you to proceed with your opening statements, and I will probably attempt the questioning after you have all concluded, although I may get carried away and jump in at will, which is one of the prerogatives of the Chair, I have learned from some of my older colleagues. I do not have any order, but perhaps in the order of the panel.

Commissioner Sundberg.

STATEMENTS OF HON. ROBERT SUNDBERG, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY, STATE OF ALASKA, ACCOMPANIED BY LT. TOM STEARNS, GLENN HERBST, POLICE CHIEF, DILLINGHAM, AK; GARY LIMING, SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE OF THE SEATTLE FIELD DIVISION OF THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; AND JAMES SWARTZ, ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

Dr. SUNDBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, I would like the record to note, and the people of Alaska to know that you, sir, have intervened on the Federal level for certain drug interdiction programs in Alaska, primarily the Postal Interdiction Program that we experimented with the Postal Service and othere here about 1 year ago. And I am quite sure during the course of this testimony you are going to be hearing more about the involvement of the Postal Service in drug distribution in Alaska.

It is certainly my pleasure to have this opportunity to present our views on Alaska's and this Nation's drug abuse problems today.

About 1 year ago I traveled to Washington, DC, at the request of Representative Rangel, to testify in front of the Select Narcotics and Drug Abuse Committee of the House of Representatives. The testimony I give today is going to be very similar to what I gave at that time, sir.

I would like to begin by stating for the record five recommendations on how the Federal Government can assist the State and local efforts in combating these crimes. A more concerted effort to curtail the use of the U.S. Postal Service in the transportation of illegal drugs. The second is increased staffing in the Drug Enforcement Agency and the U.S. attorney's office here in Alaska. A coordinated exchange of needed information between distant law enforcement agencies. The fourth is the continued support of the Federal Government of the Western States Information Network. And the fifth is the support and hopeful passage of H.R. 526, the "State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985." I will elaborate on these recommendations later in this testimony

In our view, nationwide, drug trafficking, use, and abuse has catapulted and continues to grow daily. The State of Alaska finds itself plagued with the same ills felt by all the other States. The State and local authorities recognize their position as being responsible to the needs of the people of Alaska. Yet it does not appear to be a problem that is going to be resolved by Alaska alone.

For the drug trafficker, there are no boundaries and no cost restrictions. Their business is estimated to exceed $100 billion a year. Thus, there must exist an unbroken link between the States, local authorities, Federal agencies and the people of our country in the fight against drug trafficking and abuse.

The effect of this growing drug industry is seen in our quality of justice, and in our inability to meet the demands on our drug abuse and prevention programs. Our narcotics enforcement officers are turning away cases because they are only able to handle a few major cases, which seem to be present one after the other. Prosecutors are so deluged with cases that they are forced to decline prosecution on all but the major cases. The court calendars are full. The conviction rate is astronomically high, and as a result, correctional facilities are bulging with inmate populations. The abuse and self-help programs are filled and probation and parole officers handle far more individuals than is recommended.

The changes we have witnessed here in Alaska in the last 10 years, and in the Nation, tell us a great deal about our current situation. You covered some of this, Senator, in your opening remarks.

The average quality or percentage of the cocaine purchased in Alaska has gone from 10 percent in the 1970's to 60 percent today, with quantity seizures of virtually pure cocaine showing up on a regular basis. In the case of heroin, 1 to 3 percent purity—purity of street heroin is a thing of the past. Purchases and seizures recently have shown 50 to 70 percent pure heroin on the streets of Alaska.

Where 10 years ago a gram of cocaine was extremely important, and quarter ounces were the goal, we now ignore ounces; multi-pounds and kilos are the common discussion among narcotic dealers.

Sophistication, organization, and professional were words associated with law enforcement. Now they are words used to describe drug traffickers. Never seen before, but now common, even with lesser drug traffickers, as reported in Alaska and throughout the United States, are fortified houses, electric fences, monitoring cameras, RF detectors, that is radio frequency detectors, portable scanners and countersurveillance. We see phony businesses, money laundries, offshore banks, and secret numbered vault accounts.

Elsewhere in the United States, fleets of airplanes, boats, and ships are used, and lost with little concern to the drug traffickers. State of the art pager systems and computers to store transaction records are common. We hear the word financier now in drug trafficking.

Who would have perceived a few years ago that Alaska water ports and boat harbors would be used as offload points for tons of marijuana from the Orient en route to the lower 48?

As we look to the future, the view is not good. Cocaine traffic, Alaska's most prevalent drug, is increasing. Organized ethnic groups are and will become more prominent in controlling cocaine traffic. There could be a rivalry between these groups which then may lead to voilent confrontations unless they are stopped now.

Heroin traffic is on the increase. We are seeing hundreds of new users, many of them young Caucasians. Highly dangerous black tar heroin is showing up in large quantities. This heroin is linked directly to Mexican traffickers, and they are expected to increase availability, and thus control the market.

Marijuana continues to be tolerated. The results of this tolerance are witnessed in increasing amounts of cultivators, and a steady flow of marijuana up from the lower 48 States.

Hallucinogens are showing a drastic increase. The market for LSD is tremendous, followed by mushrooms. We have seen little of the dangerous drugs, such as PCP or MDA, but illegally manufactured methamphetamine is showing up in Alaska in large quantities for the first time in years.

Look-a-likes, or legally (sic) possessed fake drugs are continuously present in our school system and easily available to our youth for sale or use.

The Alaska atmosphere is susceptible to two things which we suspect will be showing up in our future. First, clandestine laboratories for producing cocaine and methamphetamines and second, a transshipping point for large quantities of drugs from the Orient, destined for Canada and the lower 48.

The present situation of drug trafficking, abuse and use is causing a tremendous cost to the economic and social well-being of the

people of this State and the Nation. We simply cannot tolerate the present situation, or allow the view of future to become fact. It is time to place drug traffickers on notice that we, as a society, will not tolerate their activities.

When the Governor hired me to be the commissioner of public safety, the first thing he asked was that I put together a strong Drug Enforcement Program in the State of Alaska. And since 1983 the rebuilding process has been taking place. As a result of this emphasis, the Alaska State Troopers' narcotics enforcement budget has increased 16 percent over the last 2½ years, and the number of fulltime narcotics officers was increased 27 percent.

Criminal charges related to narcotics offenses increased 57 percent, while the quantity of narcotics seized from investigations increased 143 percent. Communities such as Craig, Dillingham, and Haines had not received concerted narcotics enforcement prior to this emphasis. They, as well as other communities, have now received assistance and increased enforcement efforts through the new statewide narcotics program, and this emphasis continues in both planning and enforcement.

I should note at this time, Senator, that Lt. Tom Stearns is primarily responsible for the improvement in our narcotic efforts in the State.

The increased emphasis and funding in the State of Alaska has dedicated to narcotics enforcement has had dramatic returns. However, there is much that needs to be accomplished.

At the beginning of my testimony, I briefly listed five areas in which the Federal Government could provide assistance for State and local law enforcement agencies. I would like to elaborate briefly on one of these at this time.

We need congressional support for the State's goal to have the U.S. Postal Service initiate a program to use drug detection dogs in random inspections of domestic mails. If this is not possible under current law or regulation, then we request changes in Federal law that would permit it. This effort would help prevent the use of the mail system to move dangerous drugs freely around the Nation.

The present staff of the Drug Enforcement Agency in Alaska consists of two agents. The U.S. Attorney's Office is staffed to handle a narcotics caseload based upon these two agents. At a minimum, we would like to see an immediate increase of at least one DEA agent, and the necessary increase in support in the U.S. Attorney's Office. This recommendation is extremely important when viewed in light of our ports of entry interdiction program. The stopping of drugs at our airports before they are available at street level is proving to be an excellent enforcement method. These cases often offer investigative leads into major drug dealers and investigations involving several States. This type of multi-State investigation best lies within the jurisdiction of DEA and the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Often, major violations of Federal—are Federal, and must be prosecuted at that level. With the limited resources of DEA, the necessary ability to move quickly in actions and decisions is greatly hampered. A DEA agent to act as the counterpart within this interdiction system would greatly enhance narcotics enforcement efforts in Alaska and other States.

There is a need to establish a DEA-staffed clearinghouse to assure that the investigative request from one State to another, or to various Federal agencies are responded to, and the information is returned to the requesting State in a timely manner. The major importers and sellers of narcotics in Alaska are linked to the busy DEA areas, such as New York, Florida, and California. The degree of work and importance of cases in these areas often outweighs the needs of Alaska. Yet, to accomplish the most from Alaska investigations, information and investigative assistance must often be requested from these busy areas. A system to allow monitoring of requests to insure timely response would be important not only to Alaska, but for all the States.

We urge the continuation of federally funded programs such as the Western States Information Network, which is a member of the U.S. Department of Justice's Regional Information Sharing System. This is a program which aids the State and local departments in their efforts to combat major criminal activity.

The WSIN Program is unique in that it is the only RISS member that deals only with narcotics enforcement. The WSIN Program joins five Western States, Hawaii, California, Washington, Oregon, and Alaska, in exchange of narcotics information, lend specialized equipment, provides minimal buy funds and can furnish expert, analytical services to 700 State, local, and Federal agencies whose narcotics enforcement units are participating members of WSIN.

We encourage your support for H.R. 526, the State and Local Narcotics Control Assistance Act of 1985. This act provides a form of Federal funding whereby State and local law enforcement agencies and governments can obtain Federal assistance to enable themselves to initiate narcotics programs, and to pay for additional personnel, which is the most expensive budget consideration for those entities.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, this concludes my prepared testimony. We appreciate having you and this committee in Alaska to receive testimony on this very important issue.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Commissioner Sundberg.

Lieutenant Stearns, do you have a statement?

Lieutenant STEARNS. No, I do not, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Chief of Police Herbst of Dillingham?

Mr. HERBST. Thank you, Senator.

As we have seen, the problem of drug abuse is not unique to Alaska. However, Alaska is quite unique in several ways, that a majority of the drugs are transported within the State, and the impact that small amounts of marijuana, or drugs on isolated communities such as Dillingham.

Dillingham is a community of approximately 2,000 residents. It is located in Bristol Bay, and it is an example of a small community with limited access, a large summertime transient population, and a population consisting of many Alaskan Natives.

Because of the limited access, the most common means of transporting drugs into the community is either to personally carry it on commercial airlines, to use commercial air freight, or to use the U.S. mail. Because State and local law enforcement have been somewhat successful in dealing with the persons carrying or using

commercial airlines, it appears that drug dealers seem to be taking greater advantage of the security offered by the U.S. mail. The mails offer both swift delivery and a low means of moving illegal drugs over long distances, with an added advantage of having a built-in defense.

In rural Alaska, the vast majority of mail is distributed either through boxes or general delivery. If a person picking up a parcel containing drugs is stopped outside a post office, and the drugs—and the box legally opened and found to contain drugs, 9 times out of 10, the response from the person is going to be, "I don't know who sent it to me, I just picked up my mail. I have no idea where it came from." This basically, effectively avoids any prosecution against that person, whether it be through the Federal Government or through the State.

It appears that with the present regulations shielding the post office, it is virtually impossible for a small community such as Dillingham to coordinate any type of drug enforcement activity with and through the Postal Service. It is hard for the postal people in large cities to get excited about a mere pound of marijuana, or a few ounces of cocaine in a community such as Dillingham.

Looking at this from a different perspective, you have to keep in mind that a community such as Dillingham, with its limited access, is very isolated, and a constrained environment. When you consider that marijuana is customarily sold in baggies, that are about an eighth of an ounce, a mere pound from one dealer has a distribution potential of 128 people. This impact is increased dramatically when you consider that between 6 to 10 people will probably be dealing marijuana at any given time, in addition to probably another 6 to 10 dealing cocaine. In a community of only 2,000 people, these seemingly small quantities take on a different meaning.

I have been the chief of police now in Dillingham for 30 months. During this time, our officers have responded to 48 calls where a person is attempting to harm themselves, or has actually succeeded in doing so. In a majority of these cases, drug abuse was admitted, or was found to be present during post mortem pathological testing. These figures do not include accidental deaths, which have also been shown to be drug related, many having been drownings or private plane crashes.

It is hard for me when I have to sit down and discuss this with a native family that comes in from a village of 200 people or so to collect the remains of their son, a son who has killed himself while using a combination of drugs or alcohol. A family that has very little sophistication in the ways of the world and narcotics and drugs.

I have spoken many times with wives at domestic violence calls. They have gone into great detail telling about how their husbands have started out using just small amounts of marijuana, using more and more, and then using the family's resources to buy cocaine.

I want to know—or not so much how I want to know, I have a strong feeling about drugs when I see native—young native adults coming into Dillingham from villages and trading away native artifacts, or every works of art, for a mere quarter ounce of marijuana or some cocaine. That seems to bother me quite a bit. I do not

think that is very good, and it shows a detrimental effect on drugs in a small community.

Just as Hawaii or California are the hub area for drug distribution, Anchorage is a hub for distribution for the majority of the rural areas of Alaska. I feel more emphasis needs to be placed on working with small amounts of illegal drugs to these rural areas. When a town as small as Dillingham has a rash of 18 burglaries, all drug related, or that the only armed robbery was found specifically to be cocaine related, this is a major negative impact on the entire community.

The problem is serious and more needs to be done to strengthen the position of local law enforcement. Alaskan law enforcement has and is presently working in this area, but we do need additional support and assistance in other areas, as well.

I believe State search warrants need to be honored by the Postal Service. State and local law enforcement need to be able to obtain and execute these search warrants without having to be bogged down with Postal Inspector's assistance and approval.

Regulations also need to be revised or changed to allow State and local law enforcement to use canine drug detection within postal facilities. I feel that these changes can be made without degrading the integrity of the U.S. Postal Service, and in fact, would in most cases probably enhance the integrity of the Postal Service in the minds of many citizens.

I feel that rather than increasing the budget of the Postal Service by funding numerous additional Postal inspector positions, that we should allow the State and local law enforcement officers and agencies to work withing the boundaries established for search and seizure within their respective jurisdictions.

It is always nice to get the big guys, but if we do not take a more serious stand against the small dealers, especially in small communities, we are going to be picked away and undermined in our overall effectiveness against the problem of drug abuse.

Thank you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Chief Herbst.

Our next witness is Gary Liming, special agent in charge of the Seattle Field Division, Drug Enforcement Agency, U.S. Department of Justice. We welcome you to the hearing. We look forward to your testimony.

Mr. LIMING. Thank you, Senator.

I have submitted a statement for the record. With your permission——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Your entire statement will be entered in the record, as if read.

Mr. LIMING. And I would like to make a few verbal comments, and then be prepared to answer any questions.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Please proceed.

Mr. LIMING. The serious problems of drug abuse and drug trafficking, and the difficulties involved in effectively attacking these problems, of course, are very familiar to all of us. In the past several years, an intense antidrug effort has begun to show some results. We are having, I believe, a significant disruptive effect on the illicit drug production and drug trafficking. Overall, at least on a nation-

al basis, we believe that fewer people—fewer younger people, are using drugs today than 5 years ago.

The public attitude about drugs and crime appears to be getting tougher. The governments of key drug source and transit countries have stepped up their efforts to stop drug production and trafficking. And these I believe are all positive signs for the future.

In the meantime, however, we remain faced with a very serious situation. Illicit drugs remain readily available in the United States. Crimes and drugs are two problems that are closely related, and the effects, are felt in nearly every family and every community throughout the United States.

These problems are very real to us, and at the local level we understand and know that the solutions often seem beyond our reach.

Internationally, the Seattle DEA Division, which encompasses the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, we are concerned primarily with the drug trafficking as it impacts on the United States/Canadian border, as well as the international flights that come in from various foreign countries in a daily basis.

I would like to take a few minutes to discuss what we believe to be the most important aspects of this mutifaceted activity, which obviously affects all of us in this State.

The geography of the State of Alaska dictates that the principal means of travel to and from Alaska, and within the State, is by air. Intelligence data and direct evidence both indicate that about 80 percent of all the drugs utilized in Alaska pass through the Anchorage International Airport, concealed either in mail parcels, in air cargo or carried in there by couriers.

The Anchorage International Airport, as you, I am sure, know, is often called the air crossroads of the world. International flights between the Far East, Europe, and the United States frequently stop at Anchorage for fueling and crew changes. During fiscal year 1984, over 11,000 international flights arrived in Anchorage during the year and approximately 1.3 million passengers were aboard those aircraft. Of those, approximately 100,000 passengers and crew members cleared customs, and entered the United States at Anchorage. The remainder merely transited Anchorage, en route to other points in the United States or Canada. There was also approximately 1,000 air cargo flights that arrived last year. I believe it is quite obvious that the potential for smuggling illicit drugs into the United States through this network of flights is obvious.

The current assessment of the drug situation in Alaska from a DEA perspective, I believe, there is no difference then, as you have heard from other witnesses. Cocaine is considered to be the major illicit drug of concern to us. Although relatively expensive when compared to the prices paid for cocaine in the lower 48 States, it is still widely available.

Currently, cocaine is selling for approximately $30,000 per pound wholesale, compared to about $22,000 to $25,000 per pound in the rest of the United States. The majority of the cocaine in Alaska arrives from Washington, California, New York, and Florida.

However, during the last year shipments from source countries did occur more frequently; as well, the size of the shipments appear to have increased. Since January 1985, law enforcement officials in this State have made nine seizures of cocaine, which were 1 pound

or greater in size, and for a total combined weight of about 25 pounds.

Now, this is a significant increase over 1984, when only about 5 pounds were seized under similar circumstances. Four of the seizures were analyzed this year, were found to be in excess of 95 percent pure. Now, this indicates to us that the cocaine had probably been refined, produced and refined in South America, and sent either direct or through intermediaries to Alaska, without being cut. Now, the significance of this is that we believe that Alaska now appears to have the cocaine distribution organization sophisticated enough to have uncut cocaine transported directly into Alaska.

But we have got to keep this in perspective. We must realize that cocaine seizures thoughout the United States have increased during 1985. During the first 6 months of 1985, a total of 9.2 metric tons of cocaine have been seized. This can be compared to a total of 6 metric tons for the same period in 1984. On a worldwide basis, during the first 6 months of this year, 21.8 metric tons have been seized.

No; there appears to be such a high level of production of cocaine in the source countries that even these heavy losses sustained by seizure can readily be overcome by the traffickers.

Another trend that we are seeing is that a greater number of cocaine processing laboratories are being found in the United States. In 1985 to date 22 laboratories have been located and seized. This is compared to 21 for the entire year of 1984.

HEROIN

The heroin availability is primarily located in the larger cities of Alaska, primarily in the gram quantities. Most of the heroin does arrive from Mexico, to our knowledge, primarily through the Washington, Oregon, California corridor. It is frequently the black tar variety, rather than the typical Mexican brown that we have known about for so many years.

In the past, intermediaries have acted between the Mexican source of supply and the distribution points in Alaska, but in recent times we have seen more and more occasions when individuals of Mexican descent are not transporting the heroin directly into the State. There is no strong evidence that we are aware of that there are frequent multikilo shipments of heroin coming into Alaska. But certainly, there are shipments, and the quantities being shipped are large enough to be of concern to everyone.

MARIJUANA

Marijuana is readily available throughout the State. The majority of the marijuana consumed in Alaska is from the domestic production, and that is primarily from California, Hawaii, and Oregon. Of course, we do face the perception that exists here in Alaska that the authorities here are more lenient toward marijuana, due to the State law that permits personal possession up to four ounces.

Even though many types of dangerous drugs, both clandestinely produced and diverted from the licit sources market, are readily available in Alaska, their use does not appear to be extensive.

Now, I believe that one of the most essential elements in effective enforcement lies in the successful cooperation between Federal, State, and local authorities. Now, it is my observation that the cooperation here in Alaska is of the highest level, and exemplifies the cooperative efforts that should be strived for throughout all the rest of the United States. And it certainly is one of the reasons that such successes have been achieved in conducting drug investigations in this State.

Along these lines, and I am sure the Commissioner will be pleased his recommendation has been heard. We are adding one agent to the Anchorage office, hopefully within the next few months.

Dr. SUNDBERG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. LIMING. And one of the things that we think that this will help will be to allow us to devote more attention to the Anchorage International Airport, which we feel is the key to successful investigations throughout the State.

Obviously, drug abuse and drug trafficking, though, are a major national and international problem, which reach into the homes of all of us. Unlike many other such problems, individuals, whether they be Government officials, or private citizens, we believe hold the key to the solution. And I believe it is true that even in law enforcement, as in every other element of effective strategy, we need strong public support, a strong commitment across the United States and around the world. Most importantly, we need public recognition that abuse of drugs is not just an individual matter, but one which erodes the society which actually protects our individual rights.

So the members of the law enforcement community, I believe, play a critical leadership role in the fight against drug abuse. Not only do our enforcement efforts disrupt the supply chain, but it demonstrates the U.S. commitment to ending the severe problem of drug abuse, and it also provides, I think, substantial assistance to parents and other concerned citizens who are working to reduce the demand for drugs. And I believe it is through this personal involvement and commitment of various elements of our society working together that we can in fact be optimistic about the future.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Liming. We are pleased to note your announcement that you have seen fit to add another agent to the Anchorage office.

Our next witness is Mr. James Swartz. Mr. Swartz, we appreciate your representing the U.S. Attorney's Office and look forward to your testimony.

Mr. SWARTZ. Thank you, Senator.

As has been noted, I am representing Mr. Michael Snaan, who was called out of State to attend the U.S. Attorneys' Conference,

but he asked me to deliver his remarks for him, and I would like to do that now.

Drug abuse is the No. 1 law enforcement problem in the State of Alaska. Promising careers, families, and futures are ruined by those who use illegal substances. Because of the relatively young population, the high discretionary income, the isolation, in many instances, from family and friends, the extreme climatic conditions, drugs are a major problem here.

Those who express the view that drugs harm only the users are wrong. Experience has shown that drugs breed violence, and robbery. There is no defense for the liberal view regarding drugs in today's society.

The U.S. Attorney's Office, charged with prosecuting violations of Federal law in Alaska, a portion of those laws are drug related. It has been our experience that the vast majority of criminal felony cases prosecuted by this office are drug related and motivated, even if they are charged as drug offenses themselves.

By way of illustration, earlier this year a defendant with many felony convictions robbed a bank at gunpoint here. During the course of this crime, bank employees were threatened and intimidated with a firearm. In an escape attempt, shots were fired at an officer of the Anchorage Police Department by the robber. The defendant's reason, upon investigation, his motivation for the robbery was simply to get money to buy more cocaine.

In another case, a bank in a small Alaskan town, which had not been burglarized, or had a bank robbery in many years, was burglarized by a group of young people who had not been previously involved in serious crime. The proceeds of the bank robbery were used to purchase drugs, and the effects of the first crime spread as the cocaine was used and sold in that community.

Each year the U.S. Attorney's Office also prosecutes a number of bank employees for embezzlement. Often the amounts embezzled are relatively small, below $2,000. The recurring motives for these thefts often more than not is the desire to buy drugs. These individuals now stand convicted of a felony all because they could not control the overpowering desire to obtain drugs.

Another tragic component of the drug problem is seen in the number of first time offenders who are arrested and convicted of selling drugs for profit. But for a need to satisfy their own addiction, or the temptation of a quick dollar, these people would probably never have become invoved in the criminal justice system.

The Federal Government cannot eradicate the drug problem alone, and needs the help of State and local enforcement agencies, and most of all the public.

This cooperation exists in the State of Alaska. The last 4 years have seen the advent of the Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee, LECC, an organization comprised of State, local and Federal law enforcement personnel. The LECC was established at the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, and has identified drug enforcement as the No. 1 objective for the district of Alaska. The Drug Enforcement Subcommittee of the Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee has been working diligently, with great success.

We feel the most important aspect of the crusade against drugs is the education of the American people about the dangers of drug abuse. Study after study has shown the dependency problems, social problems and health hazards of drug use. Recent studies show that education is paying off. Drug use among America's youth is declining, although it seems from the—some of the testimony here, that apparently that is not true in Alaska. Once there are no drug users there will be no market for drug pushers.

As this committee is well aware, the Reagan administration and the Department of Justice are also making a strong national effort against drug traffickers. The Alaska Federal law enforcement community is participating in that effort.

The new, tougher criminal laws enacted by Congress are being vigorously pursued in Alaska. The results are encouraging. Drug peddlers with no known ties to the community are being held without bail pending trial. Traffickers with no legitimate appeal points are being sent directly to jail after convictions, instead of being allowed to post appeal bonds, as has been formerly the case.

National figures show a greater incidence of crimes committed by drug abusers admitted to bail than from other offenders. The stiffer sentences authorized by the Comprehensive Crime Control Act are being asked for, and in many instances received.

Although Alaska has not yet received any resources or increased staffing from the Department of Justice drug task force, we are participating in the program. We have prosecuted five task force cases involving 11 defendants during 1983, through July 1, 1985. In addition, over 60 individuals have been prosecuted by the Federal Government for drug violations during the same period of time.

The single largest seizure of cocaine in Alaskan history was made by the DEA, and successfully prosecuted by our office. In addition, a pleasure boat carrying over a ton and a half of high grade marijuana was seized by the Coast Guard and the individuals carrying it were prosecuted and convicted in this district.

Our office has also worked with State and local law enforcement officers to stop the flow of drugs coming through major airports in Alaska. By coordinating our joint resources, a number of drug couriers have been arrested and convicted.

Last summer, a successful cooperative program to choke off the use of the U.S. mail to import marijuana into Alaska was put together by the DEA, postal inspectors, State and local law enforcement personnel, and Federal, State and local prosecutors. This program in particular was focused on preventing the flow of drugs to rural Alaska via U.S. mail.

The war against drugs is being waged aggressively in Alaska, and we are convinced that with the continued commitment and cooperation of law enforcement personnel, and education of the public, most importantly, that it can be won.

Thank you for the opportunity, Senator, to present our remarks.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Swartz.

I have got a series of questions for the record that I would like to address, and some of them will be directed individually, and some will be applied at random, so I am interested in the chart here that shows a movement in the value of drugs apprehended, on street

value, and you can see it is $2.2 million in 1982, $4 million in 1983. In 1984 it went to $5.6.

But we can note that marijuana has decreased a little bit over 1982--or, excuse me, decreased a little bit from 1982 to 1984. Previous to 1984, we had no significant identification of heroin, so the conclusion is obvious, that marijuana is about the same, heroin down a little bit—excuse me, heroin is introduced, and rather substantial, almost equal to marijuana, cocaine is down a little bit. Can you tell me if this means anything professionally to you?

Lieutenant STERNS. Yes, Senator, it does.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Lieutenant Stearns.

Lieutenant STERNS. I think it means a couple or three things that are important. One of the things is that one takes a look at resources and tends to direct them into areas that are most available for enforcement on large scale deals. Cocaine and heroin; marijuana, due to the situation that we find ourselves in, are the lesser of the drugs that we tend to enforce.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So this does not represent usage. This represents obviously apprehension, and you are implying that you spend more time on the hard drugs, and less on the marijuana, is that right?

Lieutenant STERNS. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And is it fair to say that heroin is relatively new, or you are just beginning to direct attention to heroin?

Lieutenant STERNS. We had a little of both, I guess. We were without any heroin enforcement, particularly for a couple or 3 years. We felt that there was a heroin problem, and we did move our resources toward that in 1984.

Senator MURKOWISKI. Heroin is obviously much more expensive than the other drug, cocaine, widely used, than the cocaine?

Lieutenant STERNS. Black tar heroin is more expensive than the cocaine is, yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What percentage of the drugs entering Alaska do you estimate are being stocked? I have heard 5, 6 percent, do you have any reason to have any degree of knowledge as what is really coming into the State, or is it only an educated guess?

Lieutenant STERNS. We have certainly established an intelligence information which—that would give us the impression, from your hooded witness who talked about 4 or 5 kilos a month in his organization; I would venture to say that there are at least six other organizations moving more drugs than that into our State in any given month. Our percentage of increase since we have now started an interdiction program at our port here in Anchorage, last year they seized $400,000 worth of drugs at the airport. They have seized over $2½ million this year in 6 months of operation. So we are hoping that we are becoming more effective than we were last year. I would suspect that we are in the area of well above the 10-percent mark that we hear.

Senator MURKOWSKI. In your opinion, is Alaska considered an attractive but somewhat limited market because of the availability of higher wages, and so forth, or is it attractive because of ease of bringing drugs in, or a combination, or is it not attractive at all?

Lieutenant STERNS. I do not believe that the idea of the ease of moving them in is as much as it is the present ability and the lifestyle, the money that is available. The freedom of this State, the trend to say "we are frontier people, and we do come up here, and we do want to do our own thing."

We have a young population, and we have a population that is free to do a lot of the things that do not happen anywhere else. I think those combinations of things call for the use and sale and abuse of narcotics in our State, along with the living conditions that we have.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, it could be said that, you know, that other areas that have a different lifestyle than we do, and do not have the great outdoors, still have a high concentration of drugs in the sense of having a drug problem, but I guess to reflect very extensively on what causes it uniquely in Alaska, is not going to get us anywhere, because we cannot do anything about the weather and we can talk about it. And it is going to continue to be a country of young people, and I guess the concern that many of us have in Washington was best expressed by the witness who indicated that eventually you either rehabilitate yourself or it kills you, or you go into crime, or something else.

And if one can generalize, that does not leave many reasonable alternatives for those who expose themselves, and I personally have no—you know, people are old enough to make their own decisions on how they want to live, but there is a certain age where those that are exposed to it do not have the availability of full capacity of the decisionmaking process, and I think that is the unfortunate area of it, everyone wants to at least concentrate on.

Tell me a little bit about the question of cooperation that was—it was brought up, I think by Mr. Liming, and based on my area of responsibility—from the standpoint of the State, is the FBI, and the assistance of Justice Department in working with State agencies, good, fair, excellent, need improvement, or would you elaborate, if you feel otherwise?

Dr. DUNDBERG. I would classify it as excellent, Senator. The cooperative efforts amongst different agencies in Alaska has traditionally been very good. I term it excellent. We do not hear the horror stories here in Alaska that we hear in other jurisdictions. That is a good way to put it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Are you seeing an increase in crime historically as a result of drug addiction? I mean, I have heard from Chief Herbst in Dillingham, and obviously, he has got problems today that he did not have previously.

Now, your scope of activity, Commissioner, and yours, too, Lieutenant, are perhaps a little broader in the sense of evaluating whether a percentage of crime is due to narcotic addiction, and if so, is it on the increase, or do you have any figures on it?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Senator, I do not have the—I do not have good figures to give a good response to that question.

Mr. LIMING. Senator, there is—I have a chart here in one of the little publications, but it is based on the Bureau of Census figures, and they have the different crimes, and this is, of course, on a national basis, but it is different crimes, and where drugs were a

common element in the crime, and I could make a copy of that and provide that to you as a reference, if you wish.

Senator MURKOWSKI. All right, I would appreciate that. Can you conclude anything for the Chair in the sense of generalizations?

Mr. LIMING. When I look at it here, just summarize a few of them, it shows that again that drugs were an element in this. On murder, in about—it looks like about 22 percent of the time. Rape about 23 percent. Robbery is up 38 percent. Burglary is about 40 percent. Larceny is about 30, so that kind of gives you some sense of what they found during the census.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I do not know if you gentlemen are knowledgeable, but in Great Britain they have chosen to go another way and by making certain drugs available as part of the rehabilitation process, and there is, I guess, two schools of thought on whether it works or does not work, and I wonder if anybody would care to comment on that.

Mr. LIMING. Well, I would just say that, you know, it is true. There is a great debate on whether that has really been that effective, and from my point of view, based on most of the things I have heard, we do not feel that it is quite—has been very effective.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I am wondering with regard to the recent notoriety concerning the laundering of money by some of the banks. There was a bank in San Francisco that was fined, I believe, a couple of million dollars within the last week, and is there any audit being conducted in Alaska, or any effort by the director of banking, to look into the possibility of laundering drug money through Alaskan banks?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Not to my knowledge. I do not have any——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is it an appropriate subject for consideration by your department; to address to the commissioner of banking?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Yes, it would be an appropriate subject. I believe there is a Federal requirement that every transaction of $10,000 or more must be reported to the Federal agency. Now, whether or not we have a like statute in Alaska, within the banking/financing system, I do not know.

Senator MURKOWSKI. It is a Federal requirement for national banks. I am not aware of what the State law addresses.

Dr. SUNDBERG. I am not, either.

Mr. LIMING. Senator, there is some work that we are doing. "We" meaning the U.S. Government, DEA, Customs, IRS, and FBI, with the American Banking Association, in trying to alert them as to, so to speak, the profile of a possible drug trafficker in laundering funds. I believe there is going to be, sometime in September, a large multi-State telecast, through closed circuit TV, in an attempt to get the word out to the banking community.

Now, I do not know offhand whether Alaska is in fact included in that or not. I do not think that it is. But that would indicate that the banking community is recognizing they have a responsibility, and they are starting to do something about it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any knowledge that you could impart for the record, either Commissioner or Lieutenant Stearns, with regard to—it is hearsay that has come to me direct in visiting some of the western Alaskan communities where I had been con-

fronted with statements made by responsible people who say that various people come into town mostly—oh, at one time, the discussion was northern Europeans that come into some of the smaller communities, take jobs as taxi drivers and so forth and, within a short period of time, there seems to be drugs available through those sources. And then they move out of the community and are not seen. And the question addressed to me is why are they not apprehended, because everybody knows what is going on.

Dr. SUNDBERG. Senator, I will divert the answer to Lieutenant Stearns who can relate the recent arrest of a group of just the——

Lieutenant STEARNS. In picking up on that knowledge, we did in fact agree with the communities that they were having a problem with a certain group. We did a concentrated effort and will continue that effort, both here in Anchorage particularly, because the drugs and the movement of those people were coming from here to the west coast and to the North Slope.

We just arrested five of them. We have arrested and been helped by DEA with arrest of part of that group in Miami in smuggling, and in Chicago, both bringing high quantities of cocaine back here for distribution to those areas.

So we were aware of it. It becomes a matter of being able to actually work the case in the smaller community as opposed to here where we can move more freely in our undercover capacity. That just took place about July 21 of this year.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Have you drawn any conclusion as to whether or not this type of thing, where four or five people go out there, is that a part of an organized effort in the sense of a designed criminal element, or is it just four or five guys that decide they are going to go out and crash a community and generate some bucks?

Lieutenant STEARNS. There is a fairly close tie to those groups of people, particularly when we look at a group of people that come from the same background and culture. They will tie together, not only here, but in the North Slope, in Fairbanks, and on the west coast. So I would have to say that they are organized in that sense of organization. Yes, they do move in, they do move in with the intention of selling drugs, and they are very closeknit. And they are controlled generally out of the Anchorage area.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So you would attribute it to a relationship with organized crime?

Lieutenant STEARNS. Not in the traditional sense of organized crime as I view it in moving for control of certain areas. I do think that they are organized, I think they are not only moving now into drugs, but they are moving into illegal gambling, they are moving into prostitution, and from that sense of the word, I would have to say yes, that would be organized criminal activity.

Senator MURKOWSKI. This next question is for Chief Herbst or you, Lieutenant Stearns. But I have been led to believe that in some of the very small communities where the postmaster or postmistress has knowledge of everybody in town, that they have either a strong suspect that drugs are coming in in the mail, but they know who is receiving them, and they are caught between the dilemma of living in the town with knowledge of those who might be

receiving the drugs, and the reality of what their true responsibility is, and fear and so forth.

Do you have any suggestions, Chief, or do you know of this? And, Lieutenant Stearns, is there any program of the State, or maybe I should direct it to Mr. Swartz as well, to counsel these postmasters and postmistresses in some manner or form in which to pass on observations of potential suspects, or is it one of those very difficult things to address?

Go ahead, Chief.

Mr. HERBST. Well, just briefly, I can say there has been times when I have worked through Lieutenant Stearns and he in turn works with the postal authorities where, rather than obtaining the information directly from the postmistress in Dillingham, I have to turn around and get my information from Anchorage, because she has expressed to me that she has to abide by her regulations and the wishes of her supervisors to not directly pass that information to the local police. So, yes, it has been a problem, and I think it is a problem for the people that work in the community because we do, we see them every day in the grocery store, we know their kids. We are a small closeknit community, and their not having any ability to work directly with their local police department I think it does hurt.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Lieutenant?

Lieutenant STEARNS. In recommendations, Senator, in talking to the postal authorities, we requested that they do begin, and with your support, they begin some education program for the postmistresses and postmasters in the small village, in the small communities. And in being aware of those, their own independent knowledge, and passing that back into the postal inspector so that he can pass it on to us and we might be able to work it under a position where they would not have to be in jeopardy in and of themselves. So that we were guaranteed that tool would be beginning through the Postal Service and an education program.

I do know that there are a couple of small communities where the postmistress or master have felt positive in dealing with that manner are now aware of those problems.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I wonder, Mr. Swartz, if this is under the area of the U.S. attorney in making a presentation to the postmaster, mistresses, which meet annually somewhere in Alaska on procedure, or is that something that is already done and they are aware of it?

Mr. SWARTZ. I am not aware that it has ever been done. We would be happy to participate in something.

I can imagine, though, the great difficulty that a person in the small community would have in testifying repetitively in cases in which he was an instrument of the prosecution. Of course, we would be happy to have someone like that, but I can imagine it would be certainly difficult for them to do so and continue to live in the community unless they were given some kind of anonymous treatment whereby they could—the information would be given to authorities, but yet this source of the information could be kept secret.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, we have had, I think, a rather difficult, yet, to some extent responsive effort in trying to address the

concern of the post office, which is the privacy of the mails, and rightly so. But, by the same token, the mails were not designed to be a conduit for illicit drugs.

So we walk that fine line, and I think we are making some progress.

The question from your standpoint in enforcement, what specifically should be done in legislative changes that would address the dual concerns, and if you have any now, I would appreciate these for the record, or if you would care to submit them in written form, the record will remain open because we have had, you know, some very difficult times in the sense of trying to get dogs to various post offices throughou. the State and reactions are all different. And then the charge that the postmaster has to allow an appropriate deputized postal inspector when I think there are only two or three postal inspectors in the whole State.

So, you know, it is different. If you are in Cleveland, OH, you can get some people and personnel quickly over, but in Alaska, you cannot do it. And I have no hesitation about making an appeal based on our geographical uniqueness. But I have to know, and when I say "I," I am talking about myself, and my colleagues as well, specifically what you need to work with to address the problem.

I can sit here and evaluate what it would be if you had half a dozen dogs out at the airport. You could effectively reduce exposure in that area, I would assume.

And then the question, I guess, is one that I will ask now, why do we not? If most of the drugs are coming in that, and are coming in luggage, why do we not funnel our revenues into having those baggage carts or whatever exposed to at least a cursory examination?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Explain about——

Lieutenant STEARNS. We——

Dr. SUNDBERG [continuing]. Your airport detail.

Lieutenant STEARNS. We have in fact made a move toward that, Senator. We have increased the staff of the airport detail. We have, with the help of DEA, sent them to Chicago O'Hare where there is the same type of interdiction program done. We have brought them back, increased their staff. We have added two new dogs, bringing out level of State dogs in the State troopers to three, two of them working at this airport, one available to go on line to work the Fairbanks Airport. We supported an Elks Club program that brought half a dozen new dogs into the State for drug search purposes. We intend to put that on line.

We are also looking at a program of traveling with our interdiction people at our airport to the smaller communities to set up and see if we cannot interdict coming in there—running surprise 2-week programs or something to that effect.

Senator MURKOWSKI. What help are you getting from the Federal Government? This is an interstate commerce so it is a Federal responsibility, is it not?

Lieutenant STEARNS. We certainly have received—the U.S. Attorney's Office has prosecuted our cases for us on this program. The Drug Enforcement Administration is assisting in being able to allow us to take cases and information back to source-city areas

that have resulted in numerous arrests this year and seizures of drugs in California and Washington.

I think that certainly the additional man who I hope will wind up in the port interdiction area is going to be a real step toward doing exactly what you suggest, and that is trying to stop it right there.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Whose responsibility is drug trafficking in the sense of coming in the aircraft and luggage, Mr. Liming?

Mr. LIMING. You mean from a DEA standpoint or——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, is it interstate trafficking and is that not a Federal responsibility?

Mr. LIMING. From a DEA standpoint, it does not matter whether it is interstate or not. I mean that is not a deciding or essential element. Certainly we have a direct responsibility to do everything possible and——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have any dogs in Alaska?

Mr. LIMING. No, we do not. I do not think DEA has any dogs.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Federally then, it is——

Mr. LIMING. Customs.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Customs has dogs?

Mr. LIMING. U.S. Customs uses dogs quite extensively at various areas.

Senator MURKOWSKI. They are using them in Alaska?

Lieutenant STEARNS. It is my understanding that they do not have a dog now anymore.

Mr. LIMING. I do not think they do.

Senator MURKOWSKI. They do not have a dog now any more? That means——

Lieutenant STEARNS. They used to have one.

Senator MURKOWSKI. They might have had one dog?

Lieutenant STEARNS. About 3 years ago. No more that I am aware of.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Are dogs that effective? Professionally do you recommend them? Why does Customs not have a dog in Alaska?

Well, we will write Customs a letter and ask them why they do not have a dog in Alaska. We will let you know what the answer is. If they had one and they are effective—our hooded witness Carlos said mules can get around dogs. Does he know what he is talking about?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Who is a good dog man to answer that question? Tommy, can he get around our dogs?

Lieutenant STEARNS. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI. OK. Maybe the dogs picked him up.

I really would appreciate something direct on the post office for the uniqueness of Alaska because we can zero in with Hawaii. They have the same set of exposures so it is not just Alaska screaming for an exception. But there are some allies out there.

A couple of other questions and then I think we will wind this thing up with one exception.

Is bail an effective enforcement tool, or do wealthy drug traffickers just consider it a business expense?

Mr. LIMING. Our experience has been, Senator, that bail is considered a business expense by the major traffickers, or most traf-

fickers. That is, of course, why we feel that the new approach to this is where the larger bail is being set and, of course, now the direct confinement. What is the term?

Mr. SWARTZ. Pretrial detention.

Mr. LIMING. Pretrial detention is an excellent tool, and I think it is being used extensively throughout the United States. And I think that is really very effective. And my colleague here would probably be in a better position to talk about that.

Mr. SWARTZ. I think that is true, Senator. That has been a real addition, I think, to our arsenal is being able to keep someone in jail who might have the resources to make $1 million cash bond were one set. But, under the new law, we can deny any bond whatsoever in a pretrial detention if we show that there is a probable cause that he did commit the act, that there is some reason to believe he would flee or be a danger to the community. I do not care how much money he has, we can keep him in jail. And I think that is an excellent aspect of that act and it is one we have used at——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Judges supporting——

Mr. SWARTZ [continuing]. Every opportunity here.

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. It pretty well?

Mr. SWARTZ. Excuse me?

Senator MURKOWSKI. Are the judges finding that you usually have enough information? I assume it is their determination.

Mr. SWARTZ. More often than not. Sometimes—we have not won every single one of them, but sometimes they find that there are reasons why they would set a bail, and they do set a property bond. But in the great majority of cases, the U.S. magistrate here has gone along with our recommendation when we have recommend pretrial detention, and it has been effective in keeping them locked up until their trials.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Mr. Liming, does the FBI play a significant role in drug interdiction here?

Mr. LIMING. The term "interdiction" is one that I am not used to except in Alaska. We treat—I mean that term implies almost like it is a foreign country and that——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Sometimes we think we are.

Mr. LIMING. Certainly the FBI has concurrent jurisdiction, has had concurrent jurisdiction since 1982, and does in fact actively participate in investigations in Alaska as well as the rest of the United States.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Lieutenant Stearns, do you have any experience with what the FBI does in drug activity in Alaska?

Lieutenant STEARNS. I think that the FBI at this point in time are not as active as they are in some other areas of the country. I think it is something that they are extremely interested in getting involved in and are looking for ways to do that. We have worked some joint cases with them when their resources were available and, in fact, in working with DEA and the FBI at the same time. I do know that they are considering to become more active, and I think that is going to help us a lot.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I think just yesterday there was publicity given to a fine that was levied against Eastern Airlines for, I guess, not keeping adequate surveillance on what their aircraft were carrying.

Do you have any reason to believe that foreign carriers that are coming into Anchorage or Fairbanks International are likely to be carrying drugs? I assume that the responsibility is the Customs, but it usually involves collaboration between, I would assume, mechanics or somebody that has access to various parts of the aircraft.

Do you think there is a potential threat?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Well, it is potential, but I certainly have no information, Senator, ever provided to me that this happened.

Lieutenant STEARNS. We are now and have been over the last month or so discussing these issues with Customs, and hope to look for at least some kind of joint cooperative effort to make sure that we are not having it. There has been some intelligence about it, and we are going to be taking a look at it. And Customs is very interested in working together with us and using some of our dogs to check those things.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you track the generation of revenues from illicit drugs into any other criminal enterprises in Alaska? Or is there any relationship between the two? Does the drugs pretty much stand on its own, funds generated, or does it move into other areas, or can you generally——

Dr. SUNDBERG. The closest thing—I can respond to that, and Tom can correct me—the latest case with this group of people going to the smaller villages you brought up, Senator, recent arrests were made. In that one there were fronts, restaurants were opened in some of the smaller communities, and the restaurant was the front for the drug activity. So if you know that is not getting, you know, close to what—the horror stories we have heard in the States, but that is about the closest thing I know of lately.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Can you elaborate any more on the sources of drugs that are coming into the State? Some people assume it is coming in from the Orient. More testimony seems to indicate Hawaii, Mexico, up from California. Is that about it? You do not think they are coming in then primarily from through the Pacific Rim countries?

Mr. SWARTZ. Just from our experience, Senator, most of the cases that we prosecute, most of them are coming up from the lower 48.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you have——

Mr. SWARTZ. As far as cocaine.

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. Reason to believe that Alaska is a significant port of entry for drugs that would come in?

Well, we had a sailboat that was picked up by the Coast Guard a couple of years ago. I do not know where it was coming from. From the standpoint of getting it into the United States and then moving it from Alaska to California or Portland or Seattle, or is most of what is coming in—coming in for consumption here, or do you know?

Mr. SWARTZ. I think it is, Senator. The sailboat you referred to was not on its way to Alaska. It was on its way from Thailand to California, and took a northerly Pacific route to avoid detection, and got detected. And this was the nearest port of entry to bring it to to prosecute them. That is why we got the case. But we have no information it was on its way to Alaska.

Mr. LIMING. I think it is very likely that drugs could be concealed in luggage or in aircraft or whatever coming in from, say, the Far East, and so forth. But it is en route to the other parts of the United States. It is very unlikely they would take it off here in Alaska, and then have to still get it down through Canada and go all the way through.

So, I believe that a great deal of the time the drugs, wherever they are concealed, would stay in there if it is destined for the rest of the United States until it enters the lower 48.

Senator MURKOWSKI. With the enforcement by the Coast Guard of our coastline, is there any interaction between the Coast Guard, local enforcement agencies and the State Department of Public Safety in the alert process? Or is it when the Coast Guard is out looking with a C-130, patrolling the 200-mile limit, do they consciously have the capability of reporting ships that are suspicious, or is that strictly their obligation all the way through?

Do you have any State capability to do anything about it?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Yes; we have patrol vessels out there also, and Lieutenant Stearns just had a recent meeting with the law enforcement, with the officer in charge of the Coast Guard law enforcement activities in Alaska to set up coordinated efforts there. So, progress has been made there and information sharing is going on, Senator.

Mr. LIMING. Senator, this information that—whether it is developed in Alaska from any level, State, local, or Federal, that information can and should be fed into EPIC in El Paso. That is the El Paso Intelligence Center. And from there that information is then disseminated out to all Coast Guard elements in the respective areas with lookout, constant lookout lists as to suspect vessels, individuals and so forth. So there is a constant flow of information going out to the Coast Guard by EPIC.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I am going to ask you individually this question, and I will start with the Commissioner of Public Safety.

In 1975, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled the right to privacy outlined in the State constitution outweighs the potential danger of marijuana use. And this has been interpreted to permit—of permission of up to four ounces of marijuana for personal consumption.

I am interested, and I think I will start with the U.S. attorney—excuse me, Commissioner—what impact has this ruling had on youth drug abuse and drug enforcement efforts, Mr. Swartz, and why has not the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted on the sense of transportation into the home is theoretically against the law? Would you enlighten us and give us your opinion?

Mr. SWARTZ. Theoretically, of course, it is against the Federal law to possess any amount of marijuana, unlike the State law. But we live in a world of realities here, and if we are standing in front of a jury asking them to convict a person for possessing an amount that, under State law, would be a freebie and would not even be a prosecutable case, you can imagine the reaction of that jury because the defense attorney's argument is going to be exactly that. It is something that is permitted under State law so why should the Federal Government be bothering with us?

So, as a practical consequence, we do not take cases that are involving small amounts of marijuana.

And I think it definitely is a hindrance. It affects the whole attitude personally of our view of taking marijuana cases that are anywhere near an amount that the State might refuse.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, what is your impression in general on the current State law from the standpoint of whether it has any impact on drug abuse in the sense of an advancement, or is it just a negative issue? It has been contested from time to time as the uniqueness of this State, that we are the only ones that allow this. And as a consequence, professionally, does it have any effect, or is it strictly a no issue matter?

Your area of responsibility in the U.S. Attorney's Office obviously has to address reality, and you have responded to that. And I am not asking at what point you prosecute or what point you do not prosecute. But strictly from the standpoint of your job as a law enforcement agency of the Federal Government, is this consistent or inconsistent with good policy toward drug abuse?

Mr. SWARTZ. I think it is inconsistent with good policy because it promotes an attitude among people here that it is all right to possess a little bit of marijuana, that it is all right to, in effect, violate a Federal law because, under State law, the situation would not be violated with any criminal law. So, I think it contributes to a decline in the respect for law enforcement And I am certain that young people feel that same way.

I have heard my own children, and when they talk about it and other kids say the same thing, that: "Well, it's all right under State law, so why should we get so upset about it under Federal law?"

And it is hard to maintain a strict law enforcement attitude with that kind of prevalent opinion among the population here that a little bit is all right. And where do you draw the line as to a little bit? It makes it more difficult to prosecute similar cases under State law, and I think it contributes to a breakdown of anyone's respect for enforcement, strict enforcement of the drug laws.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Gary Liming, would you care to comment on the same question, the current State interpretation with regard to marijuana?

Mr. LIMING. I think that DEA's position is basically the same. We just believe that it is wrong to have the law give this type of a freebie. It does, to be redundant, I guess, but we feel strong about it. It does give a mixed signal.

Even though DEA is a law enforcement agency, we certainly recognize and have for sometime that law enforcement is not the answer to our drug problem. It is a disruptive effect. It keeps the drug problems somewhat in check, we believe, until such time as a long-term approach can have some effect, and that long-term approach is education.

You have to reduce the demand. And as long as the demand is there, we are going to have the trafficking. And so we feel that the demand has to be reduced, and that is only going to be done through education. And how do you educate your young people not to use marijuana or other drugs when the State supreme court has said that it is all right to have up to 4 ounces? And when you look at the literature that has been published about the dangers of

marijuana, it is inconceivable for me to believe anyone can feel that 4 ounces of marijuana is, in fact, all right.

I mean, if you see it has genetic, as the research has pretty well established that it has genetic changes. It affects your immune system. It causes physiological differences in the newborn, if they are smoking while they are pregnant. There is something like 2,600 different chemicals that are introduced into the body with the smoking of one marijuana cigarette. It is a dangerous drug and it has a great deal of effect on the person. And, worse, it is an introductory drug. No one says it actually causes you to go on heroin, but the people who have used heroin and cocaine, most of them have started out on marijuana, or some of the other what they call introductory drugs.

So, we just think it is a bad signal. We think it is wrong and it should be changed.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Chief Herbst.

Mr. HERBST. Well, as Jim said when he testified, it was a contradiction, and I think it is a real dangerous contradiction.

I strongly support any efforts that would be made to change it. I think it needs to be recriminalized. I guess to put a little bit of humor into it, it is like the old saying, you cannot be a little bit pregnant. You should not be allowed to have a little bit of marijuana. It is a dangerous contradiction, and I think that it needs to be changed. Especially if it has an impact on the small community where we deal with small amounts. And, in a sense, in a place like Dillingham with the limit of 4 ounces, it effectively cuts us off in any type of marijuana prosecution, because we deal with small amounts all the time.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Have you seen the effects of drugs, cocaine primarily, or heroin, in the village itself as opposed to Dillingham?

Mr. HERBST. We have had exposure to heroin in Dillingham. We have had exposure, a marked increase in cocaine in Dillingham.

Senator MURKOWSKI. How about some of the smaller villages though?

Mr. HERBST. As well in——

Senator MURKOWSKI. When it moves out.

Mr. HERBST [continuing]. The smaller villages because Dillingham is the hub for Bristol Bay.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is it distributed freely if there is enough of it in the smaller village or is it——

Mr. HERBST. Certainly.

Senator MURKOWSKI [continuing]. Tightly?

Mr. HERBST. Certainly. I talked to a young native boy from the village of Togiak the other day, which, interestingly enough, in the statewide interdiction project, was one of the small villages that was found to have marijuana going into it, and it is just free flowing. Free flowing.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And what happen to the—does his community just shut down for a few days until they get over it or—

Mr. HERBST. Yes; basically, the whole community is affected by it. You can see it even in Dillingham, a community of 2,000 people, when a load of cocaine comes to town, you can see. Problems in-

crease dramatically. It is obvious to the police department. Things get rolling.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So, it just kind of poisons the community?

Mr. HERBST. Certainly. Certainly.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And you learn about it generally after it is already distributed?

Mr. HERBST. We can see the effect. We start running into, you know, more arrests, more arrests that are related to drugs. We find people that we are arresting in possession more often during certain periods of time, and that is how we found out when certain loads get into town because out activity increases tremendously.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Lieutenant Stearns, what is your reaction working within the Supreme Court opinion?

Lieutenant STEARNS. First of all, you know, I am in favor with the rest of the panel. I think that recriminalization is the only way to go. But I think as we search houses—we have served some 700 search warrants last year. An easy 95 percent of those houses had, whether there was a cocaine bust or a heroin bust, had marijuana around. It was being used.

Senator MURKOWSKI. You mean 4 ounces or less?

Lieutenant STEARNS. Yes, it was there. It was present. We found it. Whether—whichever drug we were going after, marijuana always seemed to be there also.

I think what we did was cause an apathy and a stand that said: "Well, nobody really cares about it," and that grew. It grew to the point to where now maybe it is 7 ounces this time or maybe we ignore it completely in the back seat of a car or kick it out on the ground. The apathy that comes with the idea that there is nothing wrong with it.

The inability to explain the difference why it is illegal federally and not illegal State to our youth has caused us, I think, a real conflict with being able to make a stand on the fact that we do not believe drug and alcohol abuse can be accepted.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Commissioner, do you have any comment?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Senator, in anticipation of your question——

Senator MURKOWSKI. I see.

Dr. SUNDBERG. Two pieces of legislation were introduced in the last session of the Alaska Legislature. One was senate bill 163, and the other one was house bill 264.

I want to get this in the record so my position is clear, Department of Public Safety, and I think I speak for law enforcement, and it will just take me a couple of minutes to read this into the record, sir.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Go ahead.

Dr. SUNDBERG. An act relating to marijuana and providing for an effective date. This is the Department of Public Safety position paper, and it is identical to both the house and senate bills:

> The purpose of this legislation is to recriminalize the possession of any amount of marijuana The bill states that marijuana is injurious to public health and welfare. In addition to the public health and welfare issue from the standpoint of law enforcement, there are additional purely objective reasons why this bill should be passed.
>
> Existing State law which provides for up to four ounces of marijuana for personal use is in direct conflict with existing Federal law. By having legalized small amounts, the State is in effect encouraging violations of Federal law. Thus, only in

Alaska can one sit at home and smoke marijuana secure in the knowledge that you are breaking Federal law with the blessing of the State Supreme Court.

The existing dichotomy of Federal and State laws is confusing in the mind of the public, which expects continuity rather than conflict in the law. Such conflict tends to breed disrespect for the law in general, especially upon the impressionable minds of our youth.

Alaska's lenient attitude toward marijuana in effect creates a legal market for a substance grown illegally in other States, thereby worsening the problem of marijuana cultivation in other States.

Alaska's legalization of small amounts directly contrvene the terms of the single narcotics convention, the international treaty which outlaws marijuana and other controlled substances. The United States is one of the numerous countries which are signatories to that convention.

Legalization of small amounts of marijuana encourages most users to break the law. Absent personally growing the plants, users must buy marijuana from sellers, an illegal act, and sellers must in turn buy it from their sources, which is equally illegal.

In effect, the State permissiveness encourages violations of the law by stimulating illegal transactions involving the sale of marijuana. Legalization of small amounts of marijuana has had a chilling effect upon the investigation and prosecution of any amounts of marijuana, as witness the multipound transaction requirements of Federal and State prosecutors. And the very few cases adjudicated involving marijuana for the past few years.

Recriminalizing marijuana would not, as some fear, result in wholesale arrest of individuals possessing small amounts of marijuana since the present drug enforcement philosophy of source interdiction recognizes the far greater cost effecitveness of striking against high level distributors. And sadly there is no lack of high level drug dealers in Alaska to occupy the enforcement efforts of the narcotic officers.

So that is the position. I will leave a copy of both position papers with the committee.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

I wonder, Mr. Swartz, with regard to policy, is there a policy on prosecution on amount or is it strictly source interdiction?

Mr. SWARTZ. There is a policy, Senator. Our limitations are we generally use 100 pounds as a cut-off limit. We take cases——

Senator MURKOWSKI. One hundred pounds?

Mr. SWARTZ. One hundred pounds. We take cases less than that on an individual basis if there is a particular need to do so, but generally we do not look at cases that are very much under 100 pounds, simply because we could do nothing with those cases.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Does anyone have an opinion on why the public has been apathetic if, indeed, they have, toward the issue of marijuana possession in the homes, of 4 ounces?

The Commissioner has indicated the bills that are before the legislature, and while this is certainly a State matter to address, it also has Federal overtones, as indicated by the testimony here this afternoon. And we are concerned about the problems with drug addiction in the schools, yet the inconsistency is an obvious one. And I am wondering is there a uniqueness or peculiarity in Alaska that makes it different and therefore permissible?

Dr. SUNDBERG. Senator, if I could respond.

Since the introduction of these bills, there has not been a hue and a cry for their passage as of——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Has there been hearings held?

Dr. SUNDBERG. I think there was one hearing held in the house, and the public opinion messages to my recollection to the legislators on that committee were more in not passing this piece of legislation.

Now, we were hearing there from an organized group of marijuana users and supporters of the use of marijuana. The general populace, to my knowledge, has not taken a strong position such as the Department of Public Safety for the passage of this legislation so there is a degree of apathy possibly in the State to change that law.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, I guess one has to determine for oneself if they feel that there is a direct causal relationship between the permissiveness of marijuana and the realities that, for some reasons or others, they have three times the incidence of cocaine use among high school seniors. And you either recognize that as a fact or you choose to ignore it. And I guess that is the opportunity of the public to determine whether or not it is that meaningful or it is not.

I guess I share some of the frustration that has been evidenced by those of you who are in the enforcement area, naturally as a consequence of what I thought was a reasonable balance of witnesses.

There was one representative media group that indicated that they did not feel this was important enough to cover because it was a stacked dog and pony show. And I guess one of the realities that we have to live with is that if we do not have the opportunity to share this information, and if indeed it is not shared, then the public does not have the opportunity of determining whether it is meaningful or has little or no meaning at all, and I guess that is one of the things that you gentlemen live with continually, the reality that you feel you have an obligation and responsibility to the public and sometimes it is a little difficult to get the public's attention so that they can evaluate themselves whether there is a problem.

The record will be open for another week. There is specific referral in the testimony given with regard to some statements that will be submitted. I do not want to repeat those now We also have written testimony submitted from the following agencies: The Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Customs Service, and representing the State of Alaska, the State Department of Health and Human Services, the Alaska Area Office of Indian Health Service, the Ketckian Families in Action, affiliate of the Parents for a Drug Free Youth, the Ketchikan Police Department, the Alaska Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, the Akeela House—Akeela, I will get that right maybe—Dr. Bernard Segell, University of Alaska, Center of Addiction Studies, and have we got more?

Ms. ROGAN. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And I am going to allow 15 minutes for anyone in the audience who would care to make a statement. Depending on how many there are, I will specifically limit time.

I would excuse the witnesses, Mr. Commissioner, Lieutenant, Chief Herbst, Dr. Liming—excuse me, is it Doctor?

Mr. LIMING. No.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Not yet. All right.

Mr. LIMING. Thank you for the compliment.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Mr. Liming, Mr. Swartz, I very much appreciate your willingness to be so comprehensive in assisting us in compiling a record.

May I have hands of how many would like to testify? One, two, three, four. All right I am going to limit you to about 3½ minutes, and you may collectively come up and be seated, and I will call on you at that time.

Thank you, gentlemen.

We have three witnesses that are going to be heard. And as customary, we will start with the lady, and I am going to give you 3 or 4 minutes.

Ms. BASLER. OK.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I would appreciate you making your point. This was not prearranged, as we both know, so I appreciate the fact that you had an opportunity to attend the hearing, and we look forward to your opinions.

Please introduce yourself and your affiliation, if you have any, and be assured that anything written will be entered into the record as if read, and I would appreciate a summary.

STATEMENT OF MIA BASLER, REPRESENTING COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE ANCHORAGE COUNCIL OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Ms. BASLER. Yes; I am Mia Basler, and I represent the committee who was recently appointed by the Anchorage Council of Parents and Teachers Association. And we have given our support to the Police/School Liaison Program. This program was started in the 1984–85 school year and was piloted by the Anchorage School, police department, and the Anchorage School District.

The 2-year pilot program assigned an Anchorage police officer to a local junior high school. In August 1984, Officer Jim Ravin of the Anchorage Police Crime Prevention Section was assigned to Clark Junior High as a target area. The major goal of the program was to increase adolescents' knowledge of the criminal justice system and their part in the system. The expected result was risk reduction in the areas of alcohol and drug abuse, child sexual exploitation, and community safety issues. The midyear evaluation was conducted by Mr. Strong of the assessment and evaluation section of the Anchorage School District, and was released on March 21, 1985.

The conclusions were all very, very positive. They found the majority of the comments made during interviews were extremely positive regarding the Clark/Police Crime Prevention Program and the current police/school liaison officer.

The pilot phase of the PSL Program will expire at the end of school year 1985–86. As stated in the 1984 Anchorage Chamber of Commerce Crime Commission report, in the conclusions, the purpose of schools is to provide academics and to socialize children. School officials do not have the expertise to deal with juvenile crimes. The Anchorage Police Department does not have the manpower to actively investigate school crime. So we have—in order to get more funding for this program for next year, which has been recommended by the police department and the school district, we need at least four more police officers. In order to have four more

police officers in the school by next September, it means we already have to hire four officers in January—January, my former language came out—to get all through the academy so that other officers will then get their education during the summer to be put into the schools in September. And that is where right now we have a problem.

Where are we going to get the funding to get those four people trained, you know, and then get some in the schools by next year. The police budget goes from January through December. The school district goes from July to July. And right now we do not know how the funding is going to go. So we are trying every way we can to get some funding to get this program going.

So we have a letter here and we also have a packet which we gave to Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Ms. BASLER. To justify all this. So we are just seeking support from everybody so we can make this a possibility for the kids.

What has happened at Clark——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Yes. The pronunciation of your name is "Gasler"?

Ms. BASLER. Basler, B as in boy.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Basler. Got it.

Thank you very much, and I would appreciate receiving that material.

Ms. BASLER. You have the packet all ready.

[Information supplied follows:]

Anchorage Council of Parent-Teachers Associations

At the beginning of school year '84-'85, the Anchorage School District and the Anchorage Police Department entered into a pilot program named the Anchorage Police/School Liaison (PSL) Program.

The two year pilot entailed assigning an Anchorage Police patrol officer to a local junior high school. In August 1984, Officer Jim Rehmann of the Anchorage Police Crime Prevention Section was assigned to Clark Jr. High. The major goal of the program was to increase adolescent's knowledge of the criminal justice system and their part in this system. The expected result was risk reduction in the areas of alcohol and drug misuse, child sexual exploitation and community safety issues, i.e. traffic, personal safety and seat belt safety.

The mid year evaluation was conducted by Tom Straugh of the Assessment and Evaluation Section of the Anchorage School District and released on March 21, 1985. Conclusions were drawn about the program by Mr. Straugh utilizing interviews with the forty faculty members and a portion of the eighth grade student body. Mr. Straugh had this to say about the program at that time.

> "By far the majority of the comments made during interviews were extremely positive regarding the Clark Police Crime Prevention Program and the current police/school liaison officer."

The pilot phase of the PSL Program will expire at the end of school year '85-'86. As stated in the 1984 Anchorage Chamber of Commerce Crime Commission Report under conclusions:

> "The purpose of schools is to provide academics and to socialize children. School officials do not have the expertise to deal with juvenile crimes"...."The APD does not have the manpower to actively investigate school crimes."

There is an overwhelming need to not only continue but to also expand our police/school liaison program. This can only be accomplished by either funding new positions within the police department earmarked for the program or to redirect existing

manpower into this effort. As a result, we will allow our police officials to take a preventive posture in our junior high schools and to share that expertise with our school officials and our children.

The Anchorage Council of P.T.A., representing youngsters in 64 schools in the Anchorage area, has endorsed the Police/School Liaison Program and is actively involved in seeking support for expansion and funding of this vital program - to include five police officers and to provide part time service to all our junior high schools in Anchorage for the 1986 - 1987 school year.

Your letter of support addressed to our Municipal and School District officials is greatly needed. You will find a list of suggested persons to contact attached with this letter.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Mia Bassler

Mia Bassler, Chairperson
Anchorage Council of P.T.A.
Police/School Liaison Program Committee

LETTER OF PROGRAM SUPPORT ADDRESSES

Mayor Tony Knowles
632 W. 6th Ave.
8th Floor, Room 812
Anchorage, Ak. 99501

Honorable Jane Angvik and Assembly
Chairperson, Anchorage Assembly
632 W. 6th Ave.
4th Floor, Room 410
Anchorage, Ak. 99501

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD

Jean Buchanan
Anchorage School Board Member
1540 W. 15th Ave.
Anchorage, Ak. 99501

Bettye Davis
Anchorage School Board Member
2240 Foxhall Drive
Anchorage, Ak. 99504

Lee Gorsuch
Anchorage School Board Member
5001 Buckingham Way
Anchorage, Ak. 99503

Carol Stolpe
Anchorage School Board Member
1741 George Bell Circle
Anchorage, Ak. 99515

William Frick
Anchorage School Board Member
2961 Drake Drive
Anchorage, Ak. 99508

Jim Robinson
Anchorage School Board Member
SRA Box 60-D
Anchorage, Ak. 99507

Martha Roderick
Anchorage School Board Member
1620 Hidden Lane
Anchorage, Ak. 99501

Dr. E. E. (Gene) Davis
Superintendent of Schools
P. O. Box 6-614
Anchorage, Ak. 99502

ANCHORAGE COUNCIL OF P.T.A. - P.S.L. COMMITTEE

Mia Bassler
1032 W. 23rd Ave.
Anchorage, Ak. 99503
276-3794

Janice Kvale
1027 P Street
Anchorage, Ak. 99501
272-6204

NOTE: All that is needed is a short letter to Mayor Knowles, Jane Angvik and Dr. Davis. Dr. Davis' letter can be photocopied and sent to each school board member. The letter need not be long but should reference your support of the program and your desire that it be continued beyond the pilot status. You may wish to cite information from the enclosed fact sheet.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.
The gentleman in the middle.

STATEMENT OF RANDY PAVOLKOH, CAB DRIVER

Mr. PAVOLKOH. Good afternoon, Senator. My name is Randy Pavolkoh, and I drive a cab here. I own a cab, as a matter of fact. I welcome this opportunity to talk on a Federal level.

The basic problem, it would seem to me, with drugs are all tied together. It is not something that we can just push a button here or yell over the phone there and get rid of it. It is a whole scenario. One, you know, like the shin bone is connected to the knee bone kind of thing.

I would like to line up several nails and I would like to hit each one on the head for you. I think that we need a new way to look at things. I think the number of the police that we have, or at least here in Anchorage, have to be increased. And I think quality of what we are looking for in a police officer has to be relaxed or loosened up. We pay our officers $88,000 a year on the average. We give them the finest equipment, I mean the finest equipment. And we provide for their future, and we give them the community's respect. However, what we get in return here is shoddy work.

They tell us there is only room for so many officers on the force because they have budget problems. They tell us that, well, yeah, our officers have a no strike clause, but in order to get that, for the city to get that, they had to bargain away their right to arbitration. This goes into the Federal courts. I think this is something you could help us with.

They tell us that they have priorities, and they tell us they only have so many officers around. They put auto traffic on the top of the priority list, and right after that is burglary. Drugs——

Senator MURKOWSKI. Is what?

Mr. PAVOLKOH. Burglary.

Drugs are way down the list. They place departmental integrity on the top of the list. In other words, our officers all have to look like Boy Scouts. And they hire only persons who fit into certain sorts of categories, like an ex-marine guard would make a much better officer necessarily than a librarian, an ex-librarian. I think personally that is wrong. I think we need officers from all walks of life.

The people that they are hiring here are hopelessly out of touch, out of touch with the drug problem here in Anchorage. I am not saying that the problems are all the fault of the people in charge, but I think that circumstances play a big part in this situation. But I am not absolving the people in charge either. I would say there are things they could do about it. It is just the way they think.

I think what you need here is superior methodology. The mayor himself seems to feel that many people here in Anchorage, and I have talked to him, approve of the prostitution houses that we have here, of which 35 exist, and the gambling parlors that are after-hours joints, of which almost 40 exist in town. Think of these places as 7-Eleven stores for drugs, and you start to get the idea of what is going on. There are places where you can go into almost any hour of the day or night, get all the drugs you want, drink

until you drop, place a bet on anything that moves, anything you want to do, you can walk into one of these houses and do it. OK. And they operate in this town and somehow the police just cannot seem to catch them. It is amazing to me. They just cannot seem to catch them.

The police chief takes directly from the people who call the shots here in town. And as we all know, the squeaky wheel gets the grease. Traffic, like I said, traffic and burglary are priorities along with the officers giving, you know, having a good presence.

The city's public commissioner here, I saw him quoted in the paper as saying "We don't go looking for trouble." That is like the maid saying she does not look for dirt.

This town has several breeding grounds for crime which foster drug usage There is Fourth Avenue. I do not know if you have been on Fourth Avenue lately, but it is a mess. They tried to clean it up a little bit this summer, but it was a joke. What they do is they push the problem over the hill. They have got people drinking and falling down in the streets. We have got natives coming in, they are sleeping on the streets. You know, I give my money to the church, the church takes it down to the Brother Francis Shelter. We try to help them. They turn them loose, they go right uptown again, get drunk again. It is the same thing.

Now, I am from Barberton, OH. My father was the fire chief of the town until the job killed him in 1970. I know one thing. If I were to go back to Barberton, OH, and tried to open up a place where I could place a bet on a gambling—I would sit at the blackjack table, a real live blackjack table, or throw a roll of the dice on a real live Las Vegas type, a Nevada crap table, then I would be in line here for State aid and possibly Federal aid. And I think therein lies the answer to State and Federal aid. The very first cop that saw this thing would bust the entire game. Then they would sort of stew and they would find out whether we were misdemeanor problems or felony problems. If I was a misdemeanor problem, I would get a year of State aid; if I was a felony problem I would get a 1 to 6. Flat. And there is no gambling going on in Barberton, OH. I have not been there for 10 years, and I can tell you there is no gambling going on in Barberton, OH. OK.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Would you summarize your remaining remarks, please.

Mr. PAVOLKOH. I have got one more page to do.

We have got this breeding cultures springing up left and right. You know, I am going to submit this in writing so you can look at it later. But I think you know, what can we do about it? I think we have to clean up the town. I think we have to sanitize it. And I think we have to get rid of all of, you know, the porn shops, and the topless joints and this kind of stuff, and just keep doing it one after another until we get to the answer. And I think in the case of the police officers, I think we ought to look at it in a different way. Why do we not try, instead of hiring a police officer for life, why do we not hire him for 4 or 5 years, and if he walks on the water, we will give him a contract to stay for awhile at a higher level and a higher position. That way we do not get anybody secure in their job and we do not have these problems with, OK, we will, we have got,

you know, we are going to arbitrate the money, we are going to get, you know, so much money.

Well, I am going to submit this to you. There is a lot to it but there is——

Senator MURKOWSKI. OK. I want to make sure that the record reflects on the fact that this hearing is not centered into any one area. It covers the problems in the State as a whole, so you are speaking strictly as a resident obviously.

Mr. PAVOLKOH. Well, I know it because I see this thing every day.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Sure.

Mr. PAVOLKOH. In regard to my cab, you know. But of the last five or six mass media members, maybe—murders here in town that have taken place, almost all of them have been bred out of the prostitution houses, and the gambling places and downtown Fourth Avenue, almost every single one of them. One of them I take off, right off the top of my head included a counterfeiter. What happened was the two guys had a fight, and one of them was a counterfeiter, and he comes down—the word on the street is that he had the money hidden and it is still in Anchorage somewhere.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Randy. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. PAVOLKOH. Thanks, Senator. I appreciate your listening.

Senator MURKOWSKI. We will now hear from the next witness. Sir, please go ahead, and I would like the comments kept to the subject at hand, which is drug abuse. So please proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF HANK OSTROSKY, COMMERCIAL FISHERMAN

Mr. OSTROSKY. My name is Hank Ostrosky. I am from Naknek, and I am a commercial fisherman.

We got involved in some of the studies into the mechanism of drug abuse, and actually looking at the problems more or less from the international level. And to this effect I would like to submit to you a name of a publication called "In Banks We Trust," by Penny Leneau, and this was reviewed on Late Night America about a year ago last June in which it documented in no uncertain terms the interrelationships between the various banks, the CIA, and the control of the cocaine in the United States and the banking structure which supports this, specifically coming out of the Bahamas.

There was quite a bit of information supplied to the FBI and they ran a sting out there. It was during the Carter administration. And the international implications of that into domestic surveillance by the FBI was so catastrophic that this is why they set up the program of investigation into the Bahamas, and this was killed in the United States for security reasons. And what you are looking at is the coming into the State of Alaska. As a banker, you know that the cash-flows that are supposed to be serving this town are no longer controlled by the local banks.

And if you look and chart the input of capital from the State—United States Bank, you will find that that is not sufficient to supply the capital necessary for the distribution of goods and services and also into the transportation infrastructures. You have to

look to the banks in the Bahamas, and they are coming in under various disguises to support this community.

So, therefore, what you are looking at is an international banking structure, and the tracing that we did indicate very strongly coming out of English banking structures. This not only includes—I mean, this is, you know, the pattern of colonial intrusions into various indigenous communities.

You will find that the mechanism of utilizing drugs, specifically cocaine and alcohol, and those are the chief drugs that are very very detrimental in Alaska.

And I would go against the criminalization of marijuana, because, in my observations, in the villages the marijuana is the only thing that keep the rages down, and keep the mechanisms—it is like a medicine, and this is what actually keeps the violence down. And it is the increase in cocaine and whatever the cocaine is laced with, plus your alcohol, the combination of those two, that create the degradation and actually bordering on genocide in the villages.

There is a very strong peoblem. There was a tremendous increase in cocaine into the fishing communities of Naknek this year, a tremendous amount, and also into the Bethel area, and there has been a high concentration of increase into the North Slope area, specifically into Barrow, and it is the drug of choice, cocaine, of the oil companies. And they put a lot of restrictions against alcohol, but you find out that cocaine is actually more or less tolerated because a person can function hyper under cocaine where he cannot so what you are looking at is an economic reinforcement of the distribution of cocaine.

I am not familiar with any of the heroin thing. That has just been recent.

And I would also like to draw your attention to the "Power Crimes and Mystification" by Steven Box. I researched Steven Box, and he is supposed to be the guru of the gurus of the criminologists. And in this he pinpoints certain crimes, specifically corporate crime, police crime, the increase of sexual assault, and then—this is fairly well researched. It comes out of Taverstock, England, and I would strongly recommend this as part of the record of your committee.

And the only reason I do not have Penny Leneau's book here, 2 months ago I gave it to Charlie Kay out there in Hooper Bay, and they have been doing quite a bit of investigation. And you are concerned with, like I say, CIA means "cocaine in America," and specifically cocaine in Alaska.

You will find out that there is a jurisdictional fight going on here between the FBI and the CIA because of the fact that the Alaska being disclaimer State, and North of the 60-degree parallel, you find out that there is an international connotation to Alaska in which it is treated just like a banana republic.

And I think you will find that Penny Leneau book pins the bell on the cat pretty well. And the cocaine wars that were going out in Colombia, as far as the distribution, since there has been a certain amount of curtailing of the efforts of the CIA after Penny Leneau's book, this is where you see a lot of the raw stuff coming into Alaska directly.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Mr. Ostrosky, what I would be very happy to do is if you would care to write me a personal letter on a specific question that you would like answered, I will see that the CIA answers that, and you can resolve to your own satisfaction or dissatisfaction of whether you agree with the answer. But I can give you that assurance, and I would be happy to do so.

Mr. OSTROSKY. Well, I would prefer that you look at Penny Leneau's book, "In Banks We Trust," and see the interrelationship between the domestic banks and the international banks, and specifically the Nugenhand Bank in Australia.

Senator MURKOWSKI. If you would care to put that in the form of a letter to me, I would be happy to respond to it, with appropriate detail giving you the opportunity to evaluate the answer.

Mr. OSTROSKY. I will see if I can get the book and send you the book. That would be my testimony.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate your testimony. I think that we have just about exhausted the time commitments of those who were interested enough to be with us today.

I want to thank everyone who testified. And I want to thank also our court report who has done a yeoman's job this morning.

Mr. OSTROSKY. Thank you for your consideration.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And I wish you all a good day. And thank my colleagues, John and Sheila.

This hearing is closed. Again, the record will remain open for 10——

Mr. DUDINSKI. One week.

Senator MURKOWSKI. One week. OK.

Ms. ROGAN. How about 2 weeks?

Mr. DUDINSKI. Let us make it 2 weeks.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I am going to make it 2 weeks, 2 weeks.

[Additional material supplied for the record follows:]

City of Ketchikan
Police Department

334 Front Street
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901
907-225-3111

August 16, 1985

Honorable Frank Murkowski
United States Senator
317 Hart Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Murkowski:

Mrs. Betty Wilson of Ketchikan Families in Action has asked that I write to you to convey information regarding the scope and severity of the illicit drug problem in Ketchikan. To do so, I find that I must address the problem on both an objective and subjective basis.

From an objective point of view, the only statistics I can provide are the numbers of arrests made in Ketchikan for drug offenses. In 1984, we arrested 60 adults and 18 juveniles for drug offenses. Those figures can be compared to national figures for cities of similar size which are provided by the latest F.B.I. report, "Crime in the United States - 1984." In that report, the F.B.I takes the number of arrests made in the reporting jurisdictions for various offenses along with the population figures for those jurisdictions, and extrapolates those figures into an arrest rate. The arrest rate is the number of people arrested for a given offense based upon a population unit of 100,000 people. Using those figures, the arrest rate for drug offenses in Ketchikan translates to 928 per 100,000 while the national average for cities under 10,000 population is 228 per 100,000 and the total national average is 313 per 100,000. For further comparison, the arrest rate for the State of Alaska for 1983 was 248 per 100,000.

Obviously, the arrest rate for drug offenses in Ketchikan is much greater than either the state or national average and could be interpreted as an indication that the scope of our drug problem is extensive. The arrest rate should only be considered as an indicator of the scope of the drug problem and not a conclusion since those figures are greatly influenced by the emphasis placed upon drug enforcement by local agencies as well as the effectiveness of that enforcement by those agencies.

From a subjective point of view, I feel that the illicit drug problem in Ketchikan with certain types of drugs is more serious than in the rest of the nation, specifically with marijuana and cocaine use. Apparently, many Alaskans feel that the use of marijuana is acceptable as reflected by our current state laws regarding that drug. Unfortunately, we see frequent indications that the same attitude has spilled over to the use of cocaine. In my opinion, these two drugs represent a serious problem in Ketchikan.

Conversely with other types of illicit drugs, I do not think we have as great a problem as the rest of the country at this time. From our perspective, we have not seen any PCP, LSD, amphetamines, or heroin for several years although recently we have received information that small amounts of amphetamines and heroin are available.

I hope that this information is useful in your continued efforts to combat drug abuse. If I can provide any further assistance, I will certainly do so.

Sincerely,

D.A. ANSLINGER, III
CHIEF OF POLICE

/msb

THE CENTER FOR DRUG PROBLEMS

NDTC Inc.
520 E. 4th Avenue, Suite 102
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
Phone: (907) 276-6430

August 15, 1985

The Honorable Frank Murkowski
The United States Senate
701 C Street Box 1
Anchorage, AK 99513

Dear Senator Murkowski:

It is my understanding from your staff that there will be a United States Senate Subcommittee Health and Human Services Hearing on "Substance Abuse Issues in Alaska" to be held in Anchorage on August 30, 1985. As Executive Director of Anchorage's oldest and largest out-patient substance abuse treatment facility for opiate addicts and illicit drug abusers, I am desirous of sharing some observations of substance abuse issues that this organization has made during its 11 years of existence. The Narcotic Drug Treatment Center Inc. (NDTC), dba Center for Drug Problems (CDP) opened its doors in 1974, and is funded by the State of Alaska and United Way, Anchorage has received funds from the Municipality of Anchorage in the past.

CDP rehabilitates opiate addicts/abusers and illicit drug abusers over the age of 18 in an outpatient treatment setting. Rehabilitation takes place through the utilization of a multifaceted treatment regime. Components include drug detoxificaiton, methadone maintenance/detoxification, drug free substance abuse counseling, and aftercare. Physical exams, on-going health care surveillance, and urinalysis screening for illicit drugs are also a part of the program. The program is licensed by the Federal Drug Administration and the Alaska State Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

During the early years, the static client population consisted of 25 individuals whose primary problem was opiate addiction. Currently, the Clinic serves 71 individuals in a static capacity with the primary problem being opiate addiciton. An active waiting list of 10 to 15 individuals is maintained. However, an increasing number of individuals are seeking treatment for cocaine addiction and the Center has broadened its focus to include these individuals.

It is estimated by both the Anchorage Metropolitan Drug Enforcement Unit and CDP that there are between 400 and 500 adult opiate addict/abusers in the Municipality of Anchorage. No specific needs assessment/survey has been done of this population in Alaska primarily because of the illegal nature of its use of drugs. However, shortly after a heroin ring arrest in October of 1984 over 150 inquiries were made to CDP within 72 hours by individuals seeking treatment for opiate addiction. CDP Program statistics show that there are approximately 160 men and women 18 and over who enter our program each year. These individuals can prove they are currently addicted to cocaine, opiates, or otherwise meet Federal Regualtions for methadone treatment and for who less intensive treatment is not appropriate.

Demographics of the population that the Center serves indicate that the client ratio of male to female is 67% to 33% respectively. A majority of individuals in treatment are between the ages of 26 and 40 with the youngest client being 20 and the oldest 61. Most are at the lower end of the economic scale. However, 60% are employed. Eighty percent are caucasian, 17% black or hispanic and 3% Alaska Native. The majority of clients consider their residence as Anchorage with about 10% residing in the Mat/Su Borough. At least 10 to 15 percent of the clients transfer to the methadone maintenance program from programs in other states.

It is the staff's observation that there are more individuals seeking substance abuse treatment for opiate addiction than at any time in the past. Self reports of the clients attribute this to the fact that the "street supply" of heroin is decreasing and costly. This event succeeded a period when the supply was plentiful. A number of individuals developed expensive "habits," $400 to $500 per day, which they cannot now maintain. It is interesting to note that the second most abused drug found in our urinalysis drug screening is cocaine. This has become a problem among opiate addicts as well as other polydrug abusers.

Drug Center clients enjoy the protection of federal confidentiality regulations and are reticent to speak at public meetings while still in treatment. However, Senator Murkowski, the CDP staff would welcome a visit to our facility by either you and/or members of your staff. Please have a member of your staff contact me if I can be of further assistance, or a tour of our facility is desired.

Sincerely,

Cynthia E. Aiken

Cynthia E. Aiken, MS
Executive Director

CEA/mfl

cc:

STATEMENT OF LYNDA ADAMS

August 10, 1985

To Senator Murkowski's Hearing on Drug Abuse in Alaska:

I am testifying as a mother of two children, ages 14 and 6 and also as an officer in our local "parent group" for drug education. In both capacities I am very concerned of the drug problem in Alaska especially among our youth.

I have been a member of Ketchikan Families in Action since its inception in January, 1981. This is a non-profit organization surviving solely on tax-deductible donations whose purpose is: To educate parents, to educate children and teenagers; to educate those in the community who have a decisive influence on young people about: the rising use of drugs; the commercial and social pressures that encourage such behavior; the social, psychological consequences of drug use; in order to: stop drug use among children and teenagers; counteract pressures in society that condone and promote drug use; and create a drug-free environment in the home, school and community.

Ketchikan Families In Action has been very active in drug education/prevention. One of our first efforts which drew a large focus was to close our local "head shops" which sold drug paraphernalia items. We have sent many members to various conferences and funded some school personnel to various training seminars. We are under the umbrella of the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth (NFP) which now has 8,000 volunteer parent groups across the nation concerned with keeping our nations future (our children) drug-free. We have had members attend each annual conference of the NFP in Washington, D.C., the last three years they have held conferences. We have been able to share valuable and current research information with our community and other contacts in Alaska after every conference we have attended. We have helped establish other parent drug education groups in S. E. Alaska such a Thorne Bay and in Petersburg.

An area of great concern for us in the prevention/education aspect is obtaining accurate, up-to-date information on drugs (especially marijuana, which has changed tremendously in the last 10 years with increased potency and health risks). Any information which promotes legalization of illegal drugs is also challenged by us. We also consider

alcohol a drug in all our educational efforts. Another area of concern is with alcohol information for youth which has a slant of "using it responsibly." It is our focus that for youth (under 21) there is NO responsible use of alcohol as it is illegal! There is a great need for accurate, current drug information for youth in these areas. The government should not be providing information to the contrary. We find failings in our own local agencies in these areas and have done a tremendous amount of monitoring for inaccurate information.

We have tried to up date our local libraries of current, accurate drug materials both in our public and our school libraries. We have donated several hundred dollars of materials to these outlets.

We find it very difficult to get cooperation from our local newspaper source in the dispersal of correct information. It is one of our goals to involve every aspect of the community with their role in drug education. They all have a part to play to insure drug-free youth in our community. All must give youth clear, drug-free messages. If the media would join in the efforts for drug-free youth, our community would be miles ahead and many lives could be spared.

Probably our biggest endeavor was bringing David Toma to our community in April, 1984. Toma is the ex-New Jersey undercover cop whose life was portrayed on the television shows "Toma" and "Baretta". With all-out effort and publicity in all areas, we packed our high school auditorium to a standing-room only crowd with overflow in two rooms with closed-circuit television. It was the largest audience our town has ever experienced at any community function. Toma spent 2½ days in our town reaching parent and kids alike, and having a tremendous impact. Two items on Toma are enclosed.

One of the unfortunate aspects of Ketchikan and several communities like it, is the lack of intervention and treatment avenues for kids to be helped who have a problem with drugs and want to quit. The closest treatment for adolescent drug abusers is in Seattle, 700 miles away. The whole family needs support and follow-through in these cases and that type of service is not available for our community. There also needs to be support for those returning from treatment. It is too easy in a small, isolated town such as ours for a rehabilitated returnee to the community to fall into the same drug-using peer group and pick up on the habits he/she had before.

Ketchikan Families in Action was instrumental in working with a community group to develop a comprehensive health curriculum scope and sequence for grades K-12 which includes a drug education component. Implimentation is slowly beginning to take place. It seems there is never enough money to fully utilize such a positive prevention tool. Prevention is often an area which is not financially supported, which if endorsed in all aspects, could save substantial dollars and lives.

After in indepth study by a Ketchikan City Council appointed task force in 1984, several recommendations were made in the areas of prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation. (See report attached). Action committees were appointed after this report made up of members from various aspects of the community, the purpose being to impliment some of the recommendations of the task force. I represent Ketchikan Families in Action on the Youth Prevention Task Force. Our major project to date has been to sponsor an activities fair for youth getting involvement from every aspect of the community that provided an activity for youth as an identifier of an alternative to using drugs. This was an all day event with displays or on-going activities of participation for the youth of Ketchikan, It was amazing to see all of the things there really are for youth to do in our small town.

In 1982 my daughter, who was then 11, and I started a drug-free youth group for 5th and 6th graders who wanted to grow up drug-free. Over a two year period the group grew from originally 5 members at the first meeting to 63 members. We met each week in my home and had various programs on how different drugs affect the body, ways to say "no" to peer pressure to use drugs, field trips to the jail, a visit by the police department's marcotics sniffing dog who showed demonstrations of finding previously hidden drugs, hearing from ex-drug abusers, and doing just fun alternative activities together such as swimming, dances, etc. This was all done on a volunteer basis. Two newspaper articles on the group, "Kids Against Drugs", are enclosed. (New Alaskan: April, 1983 and November, 1983). We were building positive peer pressure to <u>not</u> use drugs. I worked with this bunch of kids through the seventh grade.

At the beginning of the eighth grade my daughter and others decided it "wasn't too cool" to be labeled in such an obvious way so the group disbanded. Many of the kids still don't use drugs but being so heavily identified as a non-user at this age is tough. Some have fallen to peer pressure and are experimenters. This seems to be a very crucial age for such decisions. This group was highly successful but was crucial that it began before the peer pressure to use or the kids would not have been as receptive to the preventative education. Prevention education must be done at the elementary level and kindergarten is not too early to begin.

As I watch my daughter's peers (14 year olds) and above I see a whole new area for me and that is that many youth don't see alcohol as a drug. It is highly abused in Ketchikan among the youth. Unlike adults who drink to socialize or relax, the youth drink with the purpose in mind "to get drunk". Their whole attitude is different. Alcoholic parties are planned at the high school level the beginning of every week for the following weekend. It seems to be a major activity with a large number of high school students. A teenager can become an alcoholic in 18 months where as it may take 18 years of drinking for an adult to become an alcoholic. Their immature, developing bodies handle liquor differently from adults.

One major project Families In Action accomplished this spring was the mailing of the Safe Homes pledge to every parent of all school aged children (K-12) in Ketchikan. The purpose of this is to build parental peer pressure to provide non-alcoholic parties for youth, to make sure the parents are home during parties, and to remind parents that they are legally and civilly responsible for their minor children. Attachments are provided showing full explanation and extent of this program. See cover letter attached to Safe Homes brochure. These were mailed to all our contacts in Alaska and others in the lower 48 as well in hopes other communities would enact a similar program. Parents must work together.

This spring Ketchikan Families In Action sponsored a youth panel who gave their insights as they perceived the drug problem in the junior high school and in the senior high here in Ketchikan. One was an ex-user who was very open in his sharing. At the junior high school it was revealed that there is a lot of drug use out of school. The kids don't worry about using. If they want to use, they do. When the kids are stoned at school, the teachers don't seem to notice.

The high school students testified that many parents are saying it's okay to use, just use at home not out of the home. Many parents are providing the alcohol and marijuana for the youth. At the high school, the students felt there was not a lot of use in the building but is a lot outside. Many get drugs from their cars at lunch time. The student who used to use shared many startling facets of drugs at the high school. He said he could easily and immediately name 75 students (out of a student body of nearly 800 students) who sell drugs at the school to other students. He knew because he had bought from most of them. He said the problem is pretty bad in the school. None of the students, users or non-users alike are willing to "squeal" on someone using or selling drugs. The saying at the school is "If you're a Narc, you die!" He said there would not only be physical punishments for the "narc" but social punishments as well. The informer would be an outcast to all groups, even their friends. The students said drug use is a sign of the times - like a fad. The student who could name 75 sellers in the school said he was asked an average of 10 times per day if he wanted to buy something. Most parties are held at Ward Lake, Settlers Cove, in homes where no one is home, or in the homes where the adults are providing drugs.

All of the students knew of parents who got their kids "high" and they knew of several who grow their own marijuana. Role modeling is very important. Kids do more frequently what the parents are doing than what they are saying. In our town that has a huge alcohol problem among the adults, role modeling is affecting the youth.

Locker searches at school turn up nothing because the kids are allowed to go to their lockers to get their coats on the way out, so the lockers prove empty .

All of the students felt David Toma's coming to Kethckan really helped them, but they feel no one helps now. They feel there are very few adults or teachers they can trust to talk to. What they feel is needed for kids who quit using drugs or who want to, is to have teens that "have been there" and can stick with them for support. It's really difficult to stay straight if you've been a user.

When asked "what would make kids stop using?" the students said only two things would make a difference. 1) Don't hang around with kids that use, and 2) Being Busted. They all said "kids need to get punished or they won't stop," and right now - none are getting punished (so why not use)!

I know this sounds harsh but this is the situation in our schools from the students view. They really know what's going on with drugs in the schools - the teachers and adults don't have enough understanding of the problem yet or enough training. Many teachers ignore students who are stoned in their classes. Students who are stoned in class are unable to learn. Often times teachers get blamed for not teaching a student; whereas often it is the student who is unable to learn because he is high. It is being discovered that there seems to be a correlation between marijuana use and SAT scores. As marijuana use increases in a school, SAT scores drop.

One thing Alaska must change is our marijuana laws. It is giving kids and adults the message that it must be okay if you can have up to 4 oz. in your own home for your own use. Marijuana has changed since the Raven Case in 1975 which through the right to privacy allowed adults to have marijuana in their own homes. This must be overturned. Research is showing marijuana <u>is</u> harmful. Our laws have to change. We can role model for our kids through our laws giving them a clear message that marijuana use is NOT okay. Another reason for changing our law is that Alaska is in violation of the Single Convention Treaty of the International Narcotics Control Commision (see enclosure from US Senator Paula Hawkins).

There is now a bill in the Alaska House Judiciary Committee to again make marijuana illegal in Alaska. An all out effort must be made during this next legislative session to move that bill out of committee and get is passed.

Along the lines of legislation Alaska is one of only 12 states that has not passed a ban on the sale of drug paraphernalia. We need this law to help send a clear "no drug" message to our youth. (See enclosure)

We not only need these laws, but we need the judges and the court system to enforce these laws. It does no good to give offenders a suspended imposition of sentence (SIS) every time they are picked up. Even the youth are smart enough to pick up on lack of enforcement. They need deterents and specific reasons to not use.

I hope I have given you some ideas of areas to be beefed up to give our youth an opportunity to grow up drug-free and be productive, positive adult leaders for the future of Alaska and our nation. Our children are looking to us for direction. Let's not lead them down the wrong path. WE MUST CARE.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda G. Adams

Lynda G. Adams, Treasurer
Ketchikan Families in Action
P. O. Box 8515
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901

(907) 225-6227 (home)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

POSITION PAPER - SB 163

Support

March 5, 1985

SB 163 - An Act relating to Marijuana; and providing for an effective date."

The purpose of this legislation is to recriminalize the possession of any amount of Marijuana. The bill states that Marijuana is injurious to public health and welfare.

In addition to the public health and welfare issue from the standpoint of law enforcement, there are additional purely objective reasons why this bill should be passed.

(1) Existing state law, which provides for up to four ounces of Marijuana for personal use is in direct conflict with existing federal law. By having legalized small amounts, the state is in effect encouraging violations of federal law. Thus, only in Alaska can one sit at home and smoke Marijuana, secure in the knowledge that you are breaking federal law with the blessing of the State Supreme Court.

(2) The existing dichotomy of federal and state law is confusing in the mind of the public, which expects continuity, rather than conflict in the law. Such conflict tends to breed disrespect for the law in general, especially upon the impressionable minds of our youth.

(3) Alaska's lenient attitude toward Marijuana in effect creates a legal market for a substance grown illegally in other states, thereby worsening the problem of Marijuana cultivation in other states.

(4) Alaska's legalization of small amounts directly contravene the terms of the Single Narcotics Convention, the international treaty which outlaws Marijuana and other controlled substances. The United States is one of the numerous counrtries which are signators to the Convention.

(Continued).

POSITION PAPER
SB 163 (Continued).

(5) Legalization of small amounts of Marijuana encourages most users to break the law. Absent personally growing the plants, users must buy Marijuana from sellers-an illegal act, and sellers must in turn buy from their sources which is equally illegal. In effect, the state's permissiveness encourages violations of the law, by stimulating illegal transactions involving the sale of Marijuana.

(6) Legalization of small amounts of Marijuana has had a chilling effect upon the investigation and prosecution of any amounts of Marijuana. as witness the multi-pound transaction requirements of federal and state prosecutors, and the very few cases adjudicated involving Marijuana for the past few years.

(7) Recriminalizing Marijuana would not, as some fear, result in wholesale arrests of individuals possessing small amounts of marijuana, since the present drug enforcement philosophy of source interdiction recognizes the far greater cost-effectiveness of striking against high-level distributors, and sadly, there is no lack of high-level drug dealers in Alaska to occupy the enforcement efforts of narcotics officers.

Robert J. Sundberg
Commissioner

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

POSITION PAPER - HB 264

Support

March 11, 1985

HB 264 - An Act relating to Marijuana; and providing for an effective date."

The purpose of this legislation is to recriminalize the possession of any amount of Marijuana. The bill states that Marijuana is injurious to public health and welfare.

In addition to the public health and welfare issue from the standpoint of law enforcement, there are additional purely objective reasons why this bill should be passed.

(1) Existing state law, which provides for up to four ounces of Marijuana for personal use is in direct conflict with existing federal law. By having legalized small amounts, the state is in effect encouraging violations of federal law. Thus, only in Alaska can one sit at home and smoke Marijuana, secure in the knowledge that you are breaking federal law with the blessing of the State Supreme Court.

(2) The existing dichotomy of federal and state law is confusing in the mind of the public, which expects continuity, rather than conflict in the law. Such conflict tends to breed disrespect for the law in general, especially upon the impressionable minds of our youth.

(3) Alaska's lenient attitude toward Marijuana in effect creates a legal market for a substance grown illegally in other states, thereby worsening the problem of Marijuana cultivation in other states.

(4) Alaska's legalization of small amounts directly contravene the terms of the Single Narcotics Convention, the international treaty which outlaws Marijuana and other controlled substances. The United States is one of the numerous counrtries which are signators to the Convention.

(Continued).

POSITION PAPER
HB 264 (Continued).

(5) Legalization of small amounts of Marijuana encourages most users to break the law. Absent personally growing the plants, users must buy Marijuana from sellers-an illegal act, and sellers must in turn buy from their sources which is equally illegal. In effect, the state's permissiveness encourages violations of the law, by stimulating illegal transactions involving the sale of Marijuana.

(6) Legalization of small amounts of Marijuana has had a chilling effect upon the investigation and prosecution of any amounts of Marijuana, as witness the multi-pound transaction requirements of federal and state prosecutors, and the very few cases adjudicated involving Marijuana for the past few years.

(7) Recriminalizing Marijuana would not, as some fear, result in wholesale arrests of individuals possessing small amounts of marijuana, since the present drug enforcement philosophy of source interdiction recognizes the far greater cost-effectiveness of striking against high-level distributors, and sadly, there is no lack of high-level drug dealers in Alaska to occupy the enforcement efforts of narcotics officers.

Robert J. Sundberg
Commissioner

Gateway COMMUNITY
MENTAL HEALTH CENTER

KETCHIKAN COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOLISM PROGRAM

Director : Wesley B. Terwilliger

628 Park Ave. - Lower
Ketchikan, Alaska 99901
Phone 225-4154

August 5, 1985

Sheila Rogan
Senator Murkowski's Office
Heart Bldg. - 709
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Murkowski,

This letter is in regards to your offic's request for information on drug abuse in Alaska.

In my position as Youth Substance Abuse Counselor for the Ketchikan Alcoholism Program, I have been in contact with 109 youths on a counseling basis and approximately 200 on a classroom presentation basis during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1985.

Virtually all of these youth indicate that alcohol and marijuana are very easily obtained through school and social connections. Drugs such as cocaine, P.C.P., amphetamines are slightly less available but are frequently offered to those who may be interested. Many reported first using alcohol and marijuana before attending Jr. High School.

It is my impression that the illicit use of drugs has become very common-place and is acceptable to most youth as a form of recreation. (This is particularly disruptive to their motivation for pursuing healthy social, recreational and car er objectives). Adults often give at least tacit approval to drug abuse fostering a reluctance by youth to consider any harmful effects. With drug use being so casually accepted, those who react negatively to the opportunity to use drugs are basically excluded from school social life. This is increasingly true for Jr. High School as well as high school. A trend towards younger and younger children experimenting with drugs is apparent.

Currently this program efforts concerning youth substance abuse have been twofold. That of increasing the understanding youth have about the harmful effects of even occasional substance abuse and encouraging participation and development of healthy alternatives to substance abuse.

Programs which encourage the very young to question the harmless image of drugs and which enhance healthy approaches to social emotional and recreational needs are minimal. In comparison to the fantastic resources which promote drugs and products, very little is occuring to aide children in developing realistic approaches to life.

Sincerely,
Mike VanEerd by mm
Mike Van Eerd
Youth Substance Abuse Counselor

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY

THE U. S. CUSTOMS SERVICE, PACIFIC REGION

TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

IN ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

AUGUST 30, 1985

QUINTIN L. VILLANUEVA, JR., PACIFIC REGIONAL COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, THANKS THE COMMITTEE FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT TESTIMONY ASSESSING THE NARCOTICS THREAT IN ALASKA.

GEOGRAPHICALLY, ALASKA IS THE LARGEST STATE IN THE UNION. APPROXIMATELY 98,000 MILES OF WATER FRONT BORDER AND 2,000 MILES OF LAND BORDER COMPRISE THE ACCESSIBLE AREA. FIFTY FULL-TIME U.S. CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES ARE ASSIGNED TO THE ANCHORAGE CUSTOMS DISTRICT, COMPRISING 22 PORTS OF ENTRY AND STATIONS. CUSTOMS COVERAGE IN SOME AREAS IS INTERMITTENT OR ON A SEASONAL BASIS.

THREE NARCOTIC SEIZURES IN 1982, 1984 AND 1985 MERIT ATTENTION. IN JUNE 1982, THE 39 FOOT SAILING VESSEL ORCA WAS SEIZED IN ALASKAN WATERS CARRYING 3,210 POUNDS OF THAI STICK MARIJUANA DESTINED FOR CALIFORNIA. IN MAY 1984, THE 169 FOOT RESEARCH VESSEL ALLISON ARRIVED IN SEWARD AND OFFLOADED THREE CONTAINERS WHICH WERE LOADED ONTO A BARGE AND SHIPPED DOMESTICALLY TO SEATTLE. CUSTOMS SEIZED 12.5 TONS OF THAI MARIJUANA CONCEALED IN THE CONTAINERS. IN FEBRUARY 1985, CUSTOMS INSPECTORS AT THE LAND BORDER PORT OF ALCAN, ALASKA, SEIZED FIVE POUNDS OF COCAINE CONCEALED IN A DUFFEL BAG IN A VEHICLE DRIVEN FROM FLORIDA. THE DRIVER, BELIEVED TO HAVE BEEN A COURIER, WAS PLANNING TO TAKE THE COCAINE TO FAIRBANKS FOR DISTRIBUTION.

ALASKA STATE TROOPERS HAVE MADE SEVERAL COCAINE SEIZURES AND ARRESTS IN THE FAIRBANKS AREA DURING 1985, WHICH SUPPORTS THE CONTENTION THAT THERE IS A STEADY FLOW OF COCAINE FROM THE U.S. (THROUGH CANADA) INTO ALASKA. ALASKA REPRESENTS A "SELLERS MARKET", AS PRICES FOR COCAINE

ARE HIGH, THE DEMAND IS HIGH, AND WAGES ARE HIGH, YET COCAINE IS READILY AVAILABLE. IN JANUARY 1985, AS A RESULT OF A 10 MONTH INVESTIGATION, STATE TROOPERS SEIZUED 4.5 POUNDS OF COCAINE FROM THE CARRY-ON LUGGAGE OF A CALIFORNIA MAN AT FAIRBANKS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. THE FLIGHT WAS FROM CALIFORNIA. THE LOCAL INVESTIGATION DETERMINED THAT, IN THIS PARTICULAR PIPELINE, SOMEONE WAS DELIVERING LARGE AMOUNTS OF COCAINE TO THE FAIRBANKS AREA FROM CALIFORNIA ON A REGULAR BASIS.

SOME COCAINE IS SUPPLIED BY COURIERS TRAVELING BY DIRECT COMMERCIAL AIR SERVICE FROM LOS ANGELES. IT IS LIKELY THAT SOUTHEAST ASIAN HEROIN IS SMUGGLED IN BY COMMERCIAL AIR PASSENGERS FROM THE FAR EAST SINCE THIS IS THE CASE IN SEATTLE AND SAN FRANCISCO.

NO STATISTICS ARE AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT THE THEORY THAT NARCOTICS SMUGGLING VIA PRIVATE AIRCRAFT IS A SIGNIFICANT THREAT IN SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA. HOWEVER, AS WITH THE MEXICAN BORDER, IT MAY BE RELATIVELY SIMPLE FOR A PRIVATE AIRCRAFT TO FLY THROUGH CANADIAN AIRSPACE AND ENTER ALASKA WITHOUT REPORTING FOR INSPECTION. IF THIS IS THE CASE, THEN IT APPEARS LIKELY THAT COCAINE IS BEING SMUGGLED INTO ALASKA IN THIS MANNER.

OTHER THAN THE LOCAL DRUG CONSUMPTION PROBLEM, THE PRIMARY THREAT OF NARCOTICS SMUGGLING IN ALASKA IS TRANSSHIPMENTS OF MARIJUANA FROM THE FAR EAST THROUGH ALASKA TO THE LOWER FORTY EIGHT STATES. PRIVATE SAILING VESSELS AND MOTORIZED VESSELS CAPABLE OF TRAVELING THE 7,000 MILE GREAT CIRCLE ROUTE WITHOUT REFUELING ARE THOUGHT TO BRING CONTRABAND INTO ALASKAN WATERS OR PORTS WHERE IT IS RELOADED INTO FISHING VESSELS FROM WASHINGTON, OREGON AND CALIFORNIA, OR SHIPPED IN COMMERCIAL CARGO BY PRIVATE VEHICLE. BECAUSE OF THE SPARSE POPULATION AND LIMITED CUSTOMS

STAFFING, VESSELS OFTEN DO NOT REPORT FOR CLEARANCE AND INSPECTION. BECAUSE OF THE RELATIVELY LOW POPULATION OF ALASKA COMPARED TO THE OTHER STATES, ALASKA IS NOT AN IMPORTANT MARKET FOR MAJOR SMUGGLING ORGANIZATIONS, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THE LOAD MAY BE SIPHONED OFF FOR LOCAL CONSUMPTION. THE ALASKAN DRUG CONSUMERS ARE A HIGH INCOME GROUP AND PREFER IMPORTED, HIGH QUALITY MARIJUANA OVER HOME GROWN. THEY ARE EASILY SUPPLIED BY MAIL OR COMMERICAL AIR SHIPMENTS FROM HAWAII OR THE LOWER FORTY-EIGHT STATES.

THERE ARE ALSO REPORTS FROM RELIABLE SOURCES OF NARCOTICS BEING SMUGGLED BY CREWMEMBERS OF SUPERTANKERS THAT TRANSPORT NORTH SLOPE CRUDE OIL FROM VALDEZ, ALASKA, TO PUERTO ARMUELLES, PANAMA. FROM THERE THE CRUDE OIL IS PIPED ACROSS THE ISTHMUS OF PANAMA TO THE ATLANTIC SIDE AND LOADED AGAIN INTO TANKERS FOR SHIPMENT BACK TO THE U.S. THE SUPERTANKER CREWS PURCHASE DRUGS WHILE LAYING OVER IN PANAMA AND LATER RESELL THEM IN THE U.S. AND ALASKAN PORTS AT A SUBSTANTIAL PROFIT.

WHILE SOME OF THE DRUGS ARE OFFLOADED ON THE RETURN TRIP WHILE BUNKERING IN LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, SOME OF THE COCAINE AND MARIJUANA REMAINS ON THE SHIP UNTIL IT ARRIVES IN VALDEZ. UPON ARRIVAL IN VALDEZ, THERE IS NO CUSTOMS INSPECTION OF THE TANKER SINCE IT IS CONSIDERED TO BE ENGAGED IN COASTWISE TRADE. UNLOADING OF THE DRUGS AT VALDEZ IS COMPARATIVELY EASY, SINCE THE ONLY RISK OF CREWMEMBERS BEING SEARCHED IS BY OIL TERMINAL SECURITY PERSONNEL. THE SECURITY PERSONNEL ARE WELL TRAINED AND EFFICIENT, BUT ARE CONCERNED MAINLY WITH WEAPONS AND NOT DRUG SMUGGLING, AND IT IS RELATIVELY EASY TO CIRCUMVENT THEM.

ON ONE OCCASION, SEVEN VALDEZ RESIDENTS WERE ARRESTED BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES FOR SELLING COCAINE. THIS WOULD SEEM TO INDICATE A FAIRLY SIZABLE DRUG MARKET, IN A POPULATION OF ONLY 3,500 PERSONS. HOWEVER, OTHER CITIES SUCH AS ANCHORAGE, WITH LARGE, AFFLUENT POPULATIONS, ARE THE PRIMARY MARKETS FOR DRUGS FROM VALDEZ. IT IS ALSO EASY TO SHIP DRUGS TO THE LOWER FORTY-EIGHT STATES BY THE U.S. MAIL OR PARCEL EXPRESS SERVICE, WITH NO RISK OF CUSTOMS INSPECTION.

IN ADDITION, SMALL COASTAL TANKERS AND SUPPLY SHIPS CALL AT VALDEZ, AND IT IS POSSIBLE TO RESELL THE DRUGS TO CREWMEMBERS OF THESE SMALL SHIPS, WHO ALSO NEED NOT REPORT TO CUSTOMS WHEN RETURNING TO THEIR HOMEPORTS IN WASHINGTON, OREGON AND CALIFORNIA. THERE HAVE BEEN DOCUMENTED INSTANCES OF VESSELS SIGHTED IN THE AREA WHICH ARE OWNED BY KNOWN CALIFORNIA DRUG SMUGGLERS. THE U.S. CUSTOMS TACTICAL ENFORCEMENT OFFICE IN PORT ANGELES, WASHINGTON, RECEIVED INFORMATION FROM AN INFORMANT THAT IT WAS SIMPLE FOR A CREWMEMBER TO OBTAIN ANY TYPE OF DRUG DESIRED IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED ABOVE. THE TACTICAL ENFORCEMENT OFFICE HAS LONG SUSPECTED THAT TANKERS FROM VALDEZ HAVE BEEN DISPOSING OF DRUGS AT ANACORTEZ AND CHERRY POINT, WASHINGTON. IN ADDITION, THE U.S. CUSTOMS PORT DIRECTOR IN VALDEZ HAS IDENTIFIED SEVERAL DOCKSIDE EMPLOYEES AT THE VALDEZ OIL TERMINAL AS HAVING NARCOTICS RECORDS FROM OTHER STATES.

IN CONCLUSION, THERE IS A NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN ALASKA. EVEN THOUGH STAFFING CONSTRAINTS, LOGISTICALLY DIFFICULT LOCATIONS AND WINTER WEATHER INHIBIT CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS, NARCOTICS INTERDICTION IS CUSTOMS NUMBER ONE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY. THE PACIFIC REGION OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT INTELLIGENCE BRANCH CONTINUES TO COLLECT MORE DATA TO FURTHER DEFINE THE NARCOTICS THREAT IN ALASKA.

STATEMENT OF

LAWRENCE J. NELSON

SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

CONCERNING DRUG TRAFFICKING IN ALASKA

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM;

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

UNITED STATES SENATE

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

AUGUST 30, 1985

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony regarding the Federal Bureau of Investigation's role in combatting drug trafficking in Alaska. By way of background I would like to provide the Committee with a brief history of the FBI's involvement in drug matters in this State, tell the Committee what we are doing in this area at present, and then relate what we hope to do in the future.

Prior to 1982, the FBI's role in drug related matters was limited to disseminating drug intelligence information which we obtained from confidential sources, or by other investigative procedures during the course of our investigations. In 1982, the FBI's participation in drug related investigations was expanded, and we received concurrent jurisdiction with DEA to investigate violations under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention Act of 1970. Although the DEA remains the lead federal agency, concurrent jurisdiction permits the FBI to render assistance to DEA in selected cases, as well as to investigate drug violations which are discovered during our own investigations of other matters which are traditionally within FBI jurisdiction. This is especially beneficial to our agencies in Alaska where both agencies have limited manpower. The FBI currently has thirteen (13) Special Agent investigators assigned to Anchorage, two in Fairbanks, and one in Juneau. Each year our resources must be budgeted to meet our investigative responsibilities in such areas as domestic terrorism, foreign counterintelligence, white collar crime, anti-trust and civil

matters involving the Federal Government, organized crime, personal crimes (such as bank robberies and crimes aboard aircraft, theft of government property, civil rights matters, applicant and Presidential appointment background investigations, and training for state and local police agencies. Allocations of manpower are made on the basis of assessments made by a review of historical data, contacts with other law enforcement and community leaders, reviews of local crime commissions reports, and studying the findings and recommendations of the Congress.

During the past three years, the FBI has participated in a number of investigations with DEA and local officers, and these investigations have led to successful prosecutions of drug traffickers. We have also arrested a number of individuals from outside of Alaska wanted on drug-related matters. This past December we arrested Leonard W. Kragness, who was wanted in Minneapolis after he was indicted and charged with being involved in a multi-million dollar drug operation in the lower 48 states. Kragness was reportedly involved in the operation of 31 gold mining operations in Alaska.

At the present time, the FBI conducts drug investigations through its Organized Crime Program. This has facilitated our efforts to develop cases directed against what we consider the heart of the narcotics trafficking problem -- the organized crime enterprise.

Investigations have shown that a wide variety of organized crime groups are involved in drug trafficking across the United States. These groups include traditional organized crime groups, as well as newly evolving gangs. While there is little evidence that traditional organized crime groups such as the La Cosa Nostra have operations in Alaska, nontraditional groups are active and represent a serious criminal problem.

These and other groups are illegal businesses which generate hundreds of millions of dollars in profits. The Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 will greatly enhance our efforts to remove the profit motive from the traffickers. The new laws will also keep traffickers in prison longer.

In addition to specific violations of narcotics statutes, we are finding it more and more common that individuals we arrest for personal and property crimes are heavy users of cocaine and/or other drugs. Not only bank robbers, but bank tellers charged with embezzlement are all too frequently the victims of drug abuse. This year, for example, we arrested a bank burglar, who had no known previous involvement in crime, after he was seen dragging a bank safe behind his pickup as he could not lift it onto the truck. He attributed his "lack of judgment" to heavy drug use prior to the burglary.

Although our contacts throughout the State suggest that some types of drug abuse may have shown a decline, cocaine usage does not appear to have diminished, and many illegal drugs remain

a problem. Use of drugs has resulted in staggering losses to the community in terms of human suffering and productivity losses. Youth in even the most remote areas find drugs readily available, flown out by bush planes and sold at immense profits. Drug abuse is found in all economic levels, as well as geographic areas, in the State. The average Alaskan is younger and earns more than individuals in the lower 48 states, and thus the State provides a lucrative market. Although there has been no indication of significant drug importation or manufacture here for distribution elsewhere, there are vast amounts of money being spent on drugs imported from the lower 48 states.

The FBI in Alaska has taken steps to improve our ability to work with DEA, state, and local agencies in enforcing laws pertaining to drugs. Five of our Agents, including the Special Agent in Charge and the Assistant Special Agent in Charge, have completed two weeks of specialized training in narcotics matters conducted by DEA at the Glynco, Georgia, training facility. One Agent has been designated to coordinate our activity in drug-related matters with other agencies. One FBI Agent has secured a commercial and instrument rating for aircraft, and he will be available to assist in air surveillances throughout the State.

Durg abuse in Alaska may be curtailed by effective law enforcement, but a significant reduction in the tragic losses, economic and personal, brought about by illicit drugs in Alaska will only be achieved by the concentrated efforts of our families,

schools, and churches in attacking the problem. It has been our observation there are no such things as a "social" or "recreational" drug -- only self-destructive substances which must be removed from our communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. If you have any questions, I would be most happy to attempt to answer them.

COAST GUARD STATEMENT CONCERNING

COAST GUARD
DRUG INTERDICTION OPERATIONS
IN ALASKA

PREPARED FOR THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

AUGUST 30, 1985

THE COAST GUARD IS OUR NATION'S PRINCIPAL MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY ON THE HIGH SEAS AND WATERS SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES. WE ARE ALSO THE MOST VISIBLE MARITIME FEDERAL AUTHORITY AND ARMED SERVICE IN ALASKA. WE ARE A MULTI-MISSION ORGANIZATION WITH A WIDE RANGE OF DUTIES INCLUDING SEARCH AND RESCUE (SAR), ICE BREAKING, VESSEL DOCUMENTATION, BOATING SAFETY, POLLUTION RESPONSE, FISHERIES ENFORCEMENT, DEFENSE READINESS, LONG RANGE AIDS TO NAVIGATION (LORAN) COVERAGE, AIDS TO NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE (SUCH AS BUOYS, MARKERS, AND LIGHTHOUSES), CAPTAIN OF THE PORT FUNCTIONS, VESSEL TRAFFIC SYSTEMS, AND ENFORCEMENT OF ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL LAWS, INCLUDING THOSE CONCERNED WITH ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING. THE SPECTRUM OF COAST GUARD OPERATIONS IS SUCH THAT VIRTUALLY ALL OUR RESOURCES AND PERSONNEL ARE MULTI-MISSION IN NATURE. AS AN EXAMPLE, SEVERAL PERSONNEL AT THE MARINE SAFETY OFFICE IN VALDEZ ARE TRAINED BOARDING OFFICERS WHO HAVE TWO SMALL BOATS ASSIGNED AS BOARDING AND SURVEILLANCE PLATFORMS.

COAST GUARD RESOURCES IN ALASKA INCLUDE EIGHT HIGH ENDURANCE CUTTERS FROM ALAMEDA, SEATTLE, AND HONOLULU WHICH ROUTINELY DEPLOY TO ALASKAN WATERS PRIMARILY FOR FISHERIES ENFORCEMENT PATROLS. WHILE ON FISHERIES PATROL, THESE CUTTERS ALSO MAKE GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT BOARDINGS AND ARE ALWAYS ON CALL FOR SEARCH AND RESCUE (SAR) OR SPECIAL DRUG INTERDICTION OPERATIONS.

AIR STATION KODIAK IS THE LARGEST AIR STATION IN THE COAST GUARD WITH SIX C-130 FIXED WING AIRCRAFT, FOUR H3 MEDIUM RANGE HELICOPTERS, AND FOUR H52 HELICOPTERS WHICH PERFORM SAR AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS. THE C-130'S ARE ALSO UTILIZED FOR LOGISTIC SUPPORT OF LORAN STATIONS AND ONE H3 HELICOPTER IS USUALLY DEPLOYED TO CORDOVA DURING THE SUMMER FISHING SEASON. THE H52 HELICOPTERS DEPLOY ABOARD THE HIGH ENDURANCE CUTTERS WHILE THESE SHIPS CONDUCT LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS. IN ADDITION, AIR STATION SITKA HAS THREE H3 HELICOPTERS WHICH PERFORM SAR AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS AND ALSO ASSIST IN CERTAIN AIDS TO NAVIGATION SUPPORT IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA.

OUR TWO MEDIUM ENDURANCE CUTTERS IN ALASKA, YOCONA AND STORIS, ARE BASED AT KODIAK AND PERFORM SAR MISSIONS AND CONDUCT LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS.

WE HAVE SIX 180' SEAGOING BUOY TENDERS - TWO AT KODIAK, ONE IN HOMER, ONE IN CORDOVA, ONE AT SITKA, AND ONE IN KETCHIKAN. BESIDES SERVICING 1,400 AIDS TO NAVIGATION THROUGHOUT ALASKA, THESE CUTTERS ALSO PERFORM DOMESTIC FISHERY PATROLS, SAR, LOGISTICS MISSIONS, AND GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS.

OUR 95' PATROL BOATS - ONE EACH IN JUNEAU, KETCHIKAN, SEWARD, AND PETERSBURG - PERFORM SAR, DOMESTIC FISHERY PATROLS, AND GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PATROLS.

OUR MARINE SAFETY OFFICES IN ANCHORAGE, JUNEAU, AND VALDEZ CONDUCT MERCHANT VESSEL INSPECTIONS AND ACCIDENT AND POLLUTION INVESTIGATIONS, AND PROVIDE MERCHANT VESSEL DOCUMENTATION, WHILE MAINTAINING GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITY.

OUR BASE IN KETCHIKAN CONDUCTS SMALL BOAT SAR AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ALONG WITH SHORE FACILITY, BUOY, AND MINOR CUTTER AND SMALL BOAT MAINTENANCE.

FINALLY, ISOLATED LORAN STATIONS AT ST. PAUL, PORT CLARENCE, AND ATTU AND OTHER LORAN STATIONS AT NARROW CAPE, SHOAL COVE, AND TOK PROVIDE RADIO-NAVIGATION SERVICES AND A COMMUNICATIONS STATION AT KODIAK PROVIDES COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION IN DRUG INTERDICTION OPERATIONS IS COMMONPLACE IN ALASKA. IN RECENT MONTHS, COAST GUARD FORCES HAVE WORKED HAND-IN-HAND WITH ALASKA STATE TROOPERS, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OFFICIALS, LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS, U.S. CUSTOMS AGENTS, U.S. NAVY INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS, DEA AGENTS, AND OTHERS.

IN MARCH, THE 17TH COAST GUARD DISTRICT SPONSORED THE SOUTHEAST ALASKA LAW ENFORCEMENT WORKSHOP IN KETCHIKAN WHICH WAS ATTENDED BY ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS REPRESENTING MOST FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA. THE WORKSHOP WAS AN EXCELLENT EXAMPLE OF INCREASING INTERAGENCY COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION. FORMAL MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU'S) HAVE BEEN EXECUTED WITH THE DEA AND U. S. CUSTOMS SERVICE, AND AN MOU IS CURRENTLY BEING EXECUTED WITH THE ALASKA FIELD OFFICE OF THE FBI. THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE (LECC), CHAIRED BY THE U.S. ATTORNEY IN ANCHORAGE, IS ANOTHER VEHICLE WHICH ENHANCES INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND COOPERATION. EVERY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IN ALASKA IS A MEMBER OF THIS COMMITTEE.

THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS WHY SMUGGLERS WOULD USE ALASKA. THE MOST WIDELY USED GREAT CIRCLE SAILING ROUTES FROM THE FAR EAST TO THE WEST COAST OF THE U.S. PASS BY OR THROUGH ALASKAN WATERS. GREAT CIRCLE ROUTES REPRESENT THE SHORTEST, QUICKEST, AND MOST ECONOMICAL VOYAGE FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA TO THE U.S. WEST COAST. THESE ROUTES PASS NORTH OF THE ALEUTIAN CHAIN AND THROUGH UNIMAK PASS. ANOTHER COMMON ROUTE PASSES WITHIN A FEW HUNDRED MILES SOUTH OF THE CHAIN. AN EXAMPLE OF OUR LIMITED SUCCESS IN INTERCEPTING VESSELS USING THIS METHOD OF SMUGGLING IS THE 1982 SEIZURE OF THE SAILING VESSEL ORCA. THE ORCA WAS SEIZED 600 MILES SOUTH OF ADAK BY A COAST GUARD HIGH ENDURANCE CUTTER ON FISHERIES PATROL. THE ORCA WAS ENROUTE FROM SINGAPORE TO SAN FRANCISCO WITH 3200 POUNDS OF THAI MARIJUANA.

ALASKA HAS A VERY LARGE COASTLINE WITH RELATIVELY FEW LAW ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES TO COVER THIS SPARSELY POPULATED AREA. THE DEEP ISOLATED BAYS WITH NUMEROUS INLETS OFFER MANY LOCATIONS FOR UNOBSERVED CARGO TRANSFERS TO TAKE PLACE IN VERY SHELTERED WATERS. IT WOULD ALSO APPEAR FAIRLY EASY AND RELATIVELY SAFE TO OFFLOAD A SHIPMENT OF CONTRABAND AT A SMALL ALASKA COMMUNITY FOR TRANSSHIPMENT SOUTH ON THE ESTABLISHED BARGE SYSTEM. SINCE SHIPMENTS FROM ALASKA TO THE LOWER 48 STATES ARE LEGALLY INTERSTATE, THEY ARE

NOT SUBJECT TO CUSTOMS INSPECTION. ALASKA IS THEREFORE BELIEVED TO BE A VERY ATTRACTIVE TRANSSHIPMENT POINT. THE SEIZURE OF THE MOTOR VESSEL ALLISON IN MAY OF 1984 TENDS TO SUPPORT THIS THEORY. TWELVE AND A HALF TONS OF THAI MARIJUANA WERE SEIZED AFTER BEING OFFLOADED IN SEWARD AND PART OF THE SHIPMENT PLACED INTO THE BARGE SYSTEM AND TRANSSHIPPED TO SEATTLE.

TURNING TO COCAINE, OUR INTELLIGENCE INDICATES THIS DRUG MAY BE ENTERING ALASKA IN THREE WAYS OTHER THAN BY AIR. WE SUSPECT COCAINE MAY BE SMUGGLED FROM THE GULF OF PANAMA TO THE VALDEZ AREA BY CREWMEN ABOARD OIL TANKERS ENROUTE THE ALASKA PIPELINE. LARGE OIL TANKERS TRANSIT FROM THE VALDEZ OIL PIPELINE TERMINAL TO THE GULF OF PANAMA, WHERE SMALLER TANKERS WAIT TO ACCEPT THE OIL AND CARRY IT THROUGH THE CANAL TO EAST COAST PORTS. INTELLIGENCE SOURCES INDICATE SOME CREW MEMBERS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OIL TANKER'S RETURN TRIP TO THE VALDEZ AREA TO SMUGGLE DRUGS INTO THE REGION FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION THROUGHOUT ALASKA. HOWEVER, THIS OBVIOUS METHOD HAS NEVER BEEN SUBSTANTIATED WITH A SEIZURE.

THE SECOND METHOD USED TO SMUGGLE COCAINE INTO ALASKA IS ABOARD THE CRUISE LINERS COMING UP FROM THE WEST COAST. SMALL AMOUNTS ARE THOUGHT TO BE BROUGHT IN BY CARRIERS AND EVEN TOURISTS FOR DISTRIBUTION. THIS METHOD IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO DETECT WITHOUT SPECIFIC INTELLIGENCE DUE TO THE SMALL QUANTITIES INVOLVED, THE LARGE SIZE OF THE CRUISE LINERS, AND THE MANY DIFFERENT PORTS THESE SHIPS STOP AT ON THEIR WEEKLY TRIPS.

WE BELIEVE A THIRD METHOD OF SMUGGLING COCAINE INTO ALASKA IS BY WAY OF THE SEASONAL INFLUX OF FISHING VESSELS FROM THE SOUTH. THIS SMUGGLING IS PROBABLY ON A SMALL SCALE (A FEW KILOS AT MOST) AND DESTINED FOR SALE TO OTHER FISHERMEN AND LOCAL ALASKAN DRUG USERS. WE RECENTLY CONDUCTED A TWO DAY, INTERAGENCY BOARDING OPERATION IN KETCHIKAN DURING THE SEASONAL ARRIVAL OF FISHING VESSELS. TWENTY-FOUR FISHING VESSELS WERE BOARDED BY COAST GUARD AND CUSTOMS OFFICERS. LAST YEAR, LOCAL POLICE AND A DRUG DETECTION DOG JOINED COAST GUARD AND CUSTOMS PERSONNEL IN A SIMILAR OPERATION THAT NETTED FIVE SEIZURES OF SMALL, PERSONAL "STASHES" OF DRUGS. THOUGH WE ACT ON ALL INTELLIGENCE RECEIVED AND HAVE CONDUCTED SEVERAL BOARDINGS ON THE BASIS OF INTELLIGENCE, NO LARGE SCALE SEIZURES HAVE YET BEEN MADE ON VESSELS SMUGGLING IN THIS FASHION.

WE RECEIVE DAILY INFORMATION ON POSSIBLE DRUG SMUGGLING VENTURES AND INTERDICTION EFFORTS FROM MANY SOURCES. THESE SOURCES INCLUDE DEA AGENTS, THE FBI, CUSTOMS SERVICE, THE WESTERN STATES INFORMATION SYSTEM, COAST GUARD PACIFIC AREA INTELLIGENCE STAFF, THE EL PASO INTELLIGENCE CENTER, THE NATIONAL NARCOTICS BORDER INTERDICTION SYSTEM, AND THE COAST GUARD INTELLIGENCE COORDINATION CENTER IN WASHINGTON, D.C. THROUGH THESE SOURCES, WE HAVE ACCESS TO THE MAJOR LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA BASES. ADDITIONALLY, INTELLIGENCE IS PROVIDED BY DIRECT LIAISON WITH OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN ALASKA. ALTHOUGH THIS INTELLIGENCE SHARING AMONG MANY ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IS ROUTINE, THERE IS STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT. WE ARE WORKING TOWARD THAT END.

COAST GUARD AIRCRAFT AND SURFACE VESSELS ROUTINELY SUBMIT CONTACT AND SIGHTING REPORTS OF ALL VESSELS ENCOUNTERED. THIS INFORMATION IS SCREENED BY COAST GUARD DISTRICT AND PACIFIC AREA STAFFS. IF A SIGHTED VESSEL IS EVER SUSPECTED OF SMUGGLING, OUR UNITS AND OTHER APPROPRIATE AGENCIES ARE ALERTED.

THE INFORMATION WE RECEIVE FROM OUR PACIFIC AREA INTELLIGENCE STAFF GREATLY ENHANCES OUR EFFORTS. THEIR RESEARCH INTO SMUGGLING ACTIVITIES AND SMUGGLING ORGANIZATIONS SHOWS POSSIBLE CONNECTIONS WITH COMPANIES, INDIVIDUALS, AND VESSELS IN ALASKA. FINALLY, OUR TROOPS IN THE FIELD ARE ALERT FOR AND REPORT ANY SUSPICIOUS OR UNUSUAL ACTIVITY, INCLUDING INQUIRIES ABOUT SUCH THINGS AS CUTTER OR AIRCRAFT DEPLOYMENT SCHEDULES.

IN CONCLUSION, COAST GUARD FORCES IN THE PACIFIC DO NOT ENJOY THE BENEFIT OF NATURAL CHOKE POINTS LIKE THE MONA, WINDWARD, AND YUCATAN PASSAGES IN THE CARIBBEAN. INTELLIGENCE ON PACIFIC SMUGGLING IS SKETCHY, AS IS INTELLIGENCE ON WHAT TRENDS WE CAN EXPECT AND PREPARE FOR IN THE FUTURE. WE ARE QUITE CONFIDENT THAT GREAT CIRCLE SAILING ROUTES BRING THAI MARIJUANA AND POSSIBLY OTHER DRUGS THROUGH ALASKA WATERS. THERE IS A VAST AREA OF OCEAN THROUGH WHICH THESE NORTHERLY ROUTES PASS AND OUR CHANCES AT INTERDICTION ARE GREATLY IMPROVED THROUGH SPECIFIC INTELLIGENCE. HOWEVER, THE COAST GUARD REMAINS 100 PERCENT COMMITTED TO DRUG INTERDICTION. WE PURSUE A SMUGGLING CASE WITH THE SAME RESOLVE AND DETERMINATION THAT WE APPLY TO ALL OF OUR COAST GUARD MISSIONS IN ALASKA. THAT COMMITMENT WILL NOT CHANGE.

UNITED STATES SENATE
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE

THE STATE APPRECIATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT THIS TESTIMONY TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE. I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE A BRIEF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF DRUG AVAILABILITY AND USAGE IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE THE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS ALASKA HAS MADE IN THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

WE HAVE BEEN FORTUNATE IN THIS STATE TO HAVE BEEN ABLE TO AFFORD DEFINITIVE RESEARCH. THIS RESEARCH HAS GIVEN THE STATE THE ABILITY TO MAXIMIZE THE USE OF ITS RESOURCES. THIS IS ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT NOW THAT REVENUES ARE ON THE DECLINE.

THE DRUG SCENE IN ALASKA HAS CHANGED MUCH OVER THE LAST TEN YEARS AND SO HAS THE AVAILABILITY OF TREATMENT. IN THE PAST, MOST STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING WAS TARGETED AT THE HARD CORE DRUG ADDICT. THEREFORE, A REVIEW OF EARLY STATISTICS SHOWS A DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBER OF OPIATE ABUSERS AMONG THE CASELOADS OF THE ALASKAN TREATMENT SYSTEM.

MOST INDICATIONS REVEAL THAT THE SUPPLY OF HEROIN HAS BEEN UNDEPENDABLE SINCE THE PIPELINE DAYS. FORTUNATELY, NO ORGANIZED LARGE SCALE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM WAS DEVELOPED. NEVERTHELESS, HEROIN CAN BE FOUND IN ALASKA TODAY. LIKE MOST DRUGS, IT IS BROUGHT TO ALASKA BY A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT SOURCES AND METHODS. WE KNOW FROM NATIONAL RESEARCH THAT "DRUGS FOLLOW MONEY". I THINK IT IS SAFE TO SAY THAT AS LONG AS THERE IS A HIGH PER CAPITA INCOME IN ALASKA, HEROIN, AS WELL AS OTHER DRUGS, WILL BE AVAILABLE.

THE AVAILABILITY OF COCAINE IN ALASKA HAS STEADILY INCREASED OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS. TODAY, COCAINE IS PLENTIFUL AND RELATIVELY CHEAP. THE USE OF COCAINE HAS A BROAD AND SUBTLE EFFECT ON ALASKANS. LONG-TERM USE MANIFESTS A MULTITUDE OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CHANGES IN INDIVIDUALS. THE MOST APPARENT PROBLEM ASSOCIATED WITH COCAINE USE IS FINANCIAL. OFTEN FAMILIES SUFFER THE DEPRIVATION OF MATERIAL GOODS IN ORDER TO SUPPORT COCAINE HABITS. WITH LONG TERM USE, BASICS SUCH AS HOUSING, FOOD, AND CLOTHING ARE IN SHORT SUPPLY. COCAINE IS A SERIOUS HEALTH AND SOCIAL

PROBLEM AND WILL REMAIN SO FOR THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE. THE ALASKAN DOLLARS MAKE THE SALE OF COCAINE VERY PROFITABLE. THE VARIETY OF TRANSPORTATION USED BY ALASKANS MAKE SHIPMENT EASIER IN THIS STATE. THE MILES OF COASTLINE AND THE INTENSITY OF AIR TRAFFIC MAKE INTERCEPTION NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE.

MARIJUANA SEEMS TO BE USED BY A BROAD SPECTRUM OF ALASKAN SOCIETY. THE STRIKING FACTOR ABOUT MARIJUANA IN THIS STATE IS ITS CONSISTENCY OF USE. IT HAS BEEN PREVALENT FOR MANY YEARS AND DOES NOT SEEM TO BE AS TRENDY AS OTHER DRUGS. PERHAPS THIS IS BECAUSE OF ITS WIDE ACCEPTANCE BY SO MANY SEGMENTS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION. THIS SUBSTANCE IS NOT EXPENSIVE AND ITS USE DOES NOT GENERATE BEHAVIOR THAT IS OBVIOUS. UNLIKE ALCOHOL, T.H.C. IS MORE OF A SEDATIVE AND HYPNOTIC DRUG THAT OFTEN LESSENS ACTIVITY. MANY TIMES THIS USE OF MARIJUANA IS UNNOTICED IN PUBLIC. STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED TO THIS COMMITTEE SHOW MARIJUANA TO BE VERY AVAILABLE IN THIS STATE.

A SURPRISING FINDING OF THE STATE FUNDED STUDY WITH WHICH YOU MAY BE FAMILIAR IS THE WIDESPREAD ABUSE OF INHALANTS. THE PHYSICAL DAMAGE FROM INHALING HYDRO-CARBONS IS WELL KNOWN. YOUNG ALASKANS SEEM TO HAVE A VERY HIGH RATE OF ABUSING A WIDE RANGE OF INHALENTS. STATE PREVENTION EFFORTS HAVE BEEN, AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE, CONCENTRATED ON THESE CHEMICALS.

TO TESTIFY ABOUT DRUG ABUSE IN ALASKA AND NOT MENTION ALCOHOL ABUSE WOULD BE NEGLIGENT. ALCOHOL IS STILL THE DRUG OF CHOICE OF OUR YOUTH AS WELL AS OF THE ALASKAN ADULT. THE AVERAGE ALASKAN OVER THE AGE OF 14 DRINKS ALMOST TWICE AS MUCH PURE ALCOHOL AS THE AVERAGE PERSON IN OTHER PARTS OF THE NATION. THE MAJOR POINT THAT NEEDS TO BE STRESSED ABOUT THIS DATA IS THAT THE DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS OF THIS AMOUNT OF CONSUMPTION IS OF GREAT CONCERN TO STATE HEALTH OFFICIALS. ALCOHOL IS STRONGLY IMPLICATED IN THE VAST MAJORITY OF ALASKAN CRIMINAL INCIDENTS INCLUDING FAMILY VIOLENCE, CHILD ABUSE, AND SUICIDE, AS WELL AS ACCIDENTS WHICH ARE THE LEADING CAUSE OF DEATH IN THE STATE. MANY PEOPLE ACCEPT THIS TRAGEDY BECAUSE ALCOHOL IS A LEGAL DRUG. WE, AT THE STATE

LEVEL, DO NOT AND WILL NEVER ACCEPT THIS DESTRUCTION OF LIVES AS A SOCIETAL NORM. ITS AVAILABILITY AND DESTRUCTIVE POTENTIAL MAKE IT PUBLIC HEALTH ENEMY NUMBER ONE. ALL OF OUR RESEARCH DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE TO THE COMMITTEE AND ARE STRONG PROOF THAT DRUG AVAILABILLITY AND USE ARE SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN THIS STATE.

AN ADDITIONAL FACTOR THAT MAKES ALASKA UNIQUE IN REGARD TO DRUG ABUSE IS ITS POPULATION PROFILE. WE HAVE A YOUNG, RISK-TAKING POPULATION. THE AVERAGE AGE IN ALASKA IS 26. MOST FAMILIES HAVE ARRIVED IN THE URBAN AREAS OF THE STATE WITHIN THE LAST FIVE (5) YEARS. THEY LEFT THEIR FAMILY GROUPS BEHIND AND MUST MAKE A PLACE FOR THEMSELVES AMONG OTHER TRANSIENT PEOPLE. MANY OF THESE NEWLY ARRIVED ALASKANS BRING WITH THEM A DISTORTED VIEW OF THE FRONTIER ENVIRONMENT, ATTITUDES, AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES. THE HIGH RATE OF DIVORCE, CHILD ABUSE, FAMILY VIOLENCE, SUICIDE, AND DRUG ABUSE ALL ATTEST TO THE RESULTS OF THIS MIGRATION. ALASKA ALSO CONTAINS MANY CULTURAL GROUPS WHO ARE PAINFULLY EXPERIENCING A SLOW ASSIMILATION INTO THE MODERN TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE STATE OF ALASKA HAS BEEN RESPONSIVE IN DEALING WITH THE DRUG AND ALCOHOL PROBLEMS WITHIN OUR BORDERS. WHILE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REDUCED ITS FINANCIAL SPONSORSHIP OF TREATMENT EFFORTS, THE STATE HAS EMBARKED ON MAJOR PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND RESEARCH INITIATIVES. THESE INITIATIVES HAVE ORIGINATED IN THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF STATE GOVERNMENT, AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES. THE LIST OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS INCLUDES:

1. RAISING THE DRINKING AGE FROM 18 TO 21
2. RAISING TAXES ON BEVERAGE ALCOHOL
3. RESTRUCTURING THE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR DRUG SALES AND USE
4. LIMITING NEW LIQUOR LICENSES
5. SUBSTANTIAL FUNDING OF DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS
6. IMPROVING THE DRINKING DRIVER PROGRAMS
7. FOCUSING ON THE DISEASE CONCEPT OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTIONS
8. INITIATING A NUMBER OF RURAL-BASED, CULTURALLY RELEVANT PREVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

THESE ARE BUT A FEW OF THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE PREVENTION, TREATMENT AND TRAINING EFFORT STATEWIDE REQUIRED FUNDING, COMMITMENT, AND DEDICATED PEOPLE. THE STATE OF ALASKA ALLOCATED THESE RESOURCES TO FIGHT ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE. TODAY, DESPITE THE GEOGRAPHIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY, DESPITE THE HIGH COSTS, AND DESPITE THE DECLINE IN FEDERAL FUNDING IN 1981, THIS STATE HAS ONE OF THE FINEST PREVENTION, TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND TREATMENT EFFORTS FOUND WITHIN ALL STATES AND TERRITORIES. MANY STATES LOOK TO ALASKA FOR NEW AND INNOVATIVE IDEAS IN THE AREA OF PREVENTION. FOR EXAMPLE, OUR OFFICE RECEIVES REGULAR INQUIRIES ABOUT TREATMENT SERVICES FOR MINORITIES. INDEED, PAST STATE FUNDING HAS ALLOWED US TO TRY NEW AND INNOVATIVE TREATMENT AND PREVENTION SYSTEMS. IN ADDITION, NON PROFIT AGENCIES, HEALTH CORPORATIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE ALSO RISEN TO THE TASK ALONG WITH THE STATE.

THE FEDERAL COMMITMENT OF LOCAL CONTROL THROUGH THE OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981 HAS NOT BEEN AS PRODUCTIVE AS IT FIRST WAS PORTRAYED. RECENT REQUIREMENTS ATTACHED TO THE STATIC LEVEL OF FEDERAL BLOCK FUNDING, LIMIT THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF LOCAL CONTROL.

THIS EROSION OF STATE CONTROL AND INCREASED DEMANDS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL, OFTEN PUT STATE PLANNING EFFORTS IN A SECONDARY POSITION. UNDER THE PRESENT BLOCK GRANT FORMULA, ALASKA WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE THE SAME AMOUNT OF FEDERAL SUPPORT. THIS SUPPORT OF OUR EFFORTS IN ALASKA CONSTITUTES LESS THAN 10% OF THE ALLOCATIONS FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE. THIS IS MUCH LESS THAN MOST STATES WHICH RECEIVE 18.4% OF THEIR FUNDING FROM THE BLOCK GRANTS.

THE STATE EFFORTS DO RECEIVE SOME FEDERAL SUPPORT THROUGH FEES FOR SERVICE. ALL STATE APPROVED PROGRAMS ARE QUALIFIED TO CHARGE FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR TREATMENT SERVICES. THEREFORE, THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION BECOMES A PARTNER IN OUR PREVENTION AND TREATMENT EFFORTS BY DIRECTLY SUPPORTING PROGRAMS. THIS RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUR PROGRAMS AND THE V.A. DEMONSTRATES FEDERAL COOPERATION SELDOM SEEN IN OTHER STATES. THE LACK OF VETERANS HEALTH FACILITIES IN ALASKA ADDS MUCH IMPETUS TO

UTILIZATION OF THE STATE SUPPORTED TREATMENT SYSTEM. THE HIGH RATE OF MILITARY ENLISTMENT BY ALASKANS AND THE LARGE MALE POPULATION DEMANDS THAT THE EXEMPLARY COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BY THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION AND THE STATE CONTINUE. WE URGE THIS COMMITTEE'S SUPPORT OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION IN ITS EFFORTS TO DEAL WITH SUBSTANCE ABUSE AS A HEALTH ISSUE IN ALASKA.

ANOTHER MAJOR FEDERAL PROVIDER OF HEALTH CARE IN ALASKA IS THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE. ALASKANS ARE SERVED BY THE ALASKAN AREA NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE. THIS HEALTH CARE AGENCY HAS A LONG AND DISTINGUISHED RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT. NEVERTHELESS, THE AGENCY SOMETIME SEEMS TO RESIST RECOGNIZING ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE AS A LEGITIMATE HEALTH CARE ISSUE. THE RESISTANCE HAS LIMITED STATE AND FEDERAL COOPERATION IN RURAL AREAS. THIS UNOFFICIAL POLICY MUST BE REVERSED AND FEDERAL FUNDING MUST BE COMMITTED TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT BY THIS MAJOR HEALTH CARE PROVIDER. WITH A BUDGET APPROACHING 120 MILLION DOLLARS, APPROXIMATELY 1.5 TO 2 MILLION IS COMMITTED TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE EFFORTS. THIS UNDERFUNDING SHOULD BE ADDRESSED BY THIS SUBCOMMITTEE.

I WOULD ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT A SUBSTANCE ABUSE FUNDING INITIATIVE THROUGH THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE. THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD STRONGLY SUPPORT S 1298 AND HR 15 TO COORDINATE AND EXPAND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES TO INDIAN YOUTH. THESE BILLS OUTLINE DESPERATELY NEEDED SERVICES TO THE NEXT GENERATION OF OUR INDIGENOUS PEOPLE. THE STATE OF ALASKA IS COMMITTED TO A COOPERATIVE EFFORT WITH I.H.S. THAT MAY RESULT IN A BETTER SERVICE TO NATIVE ALASKANS. PRESENTLY, OUR OFFICE DISTRIBUTES GRANTS TO ALL TWELVE NATIVE HEALTH CORPORATIONS FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES. WE INVITE THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE TO JOIN US IN THE PROVISION OF THESE SPECIAL SERVICES. I.H.S. HAS A LONG STANDING REPUTATION FOR PROVIDING QUALITY HEALTH CARE IN RURAL ALASKA. THIS REPUTATION WOULD ADD A GREAT DEAL TO THE STATE'S EFFORTS TOWARD REDUCING THE DAMAGE OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

IN SUMMARY, THE PROBLEM OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN ALASKA IS A FEDERAL AS WELL AS A STATE PROBLEM. THE AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS IN OUR STATE CONTIN-

UES TO BE HIGH DESPITE MANY EFFORTS AT CONTROL. OUR PREVENTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM HAS BEEN DEVELOPED WITH SUPPORT OF ALL BRANCHES OF STATE GOVERNMENT. FEDERAL SUPPORT HAS BEEN ON THE DECLINE IN RECENT YEARS, AND DECLINE MUST BE REVERSED TO MAINTAIN THE QUALITY LEVEL OF SERVICES. FEDERAL SUPPORT ALSO MUST BE FORTHCOMING IN THE LEGISLATIVE AREA. SOME DEFINITIVE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE:

1. CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME INITIATIVE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. THIS CONDITION IS THE MOST PREVENTIBLE OF ALL BIRTH DEFECTS AND COULD BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

2. SUPPORT THE PASSAGE OF S 1298, THE INDIAN JUVENILE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT.

3. SUPPORT THE FINDINGS OF THE RECENTLY CONDUCTED INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE ALCOHOLISM PROGRAM REVIEW REGIONAL MEETINGS. NUMEROUS RECOMMENDATIONS SURFACED DURING THESE MEETINGS THAT, IF IMPLEMENTED, WILL VASTLY IMPROVE THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES THAT ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE AGENCY.

THE STATE OF ALASKA STANDS READY TO JOIN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN A COOPERATIVE EFFORT TO PROMOTE SUBSTANCE-FREE HEALTHY LIFESTYLES FOR ALASKANS. WE HAVE SOLICITED YOUR SUPPORT IN THE PAST AND CONTINUE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS IN A GESTURE OF COOPERATION. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO CALL ON US AT ANY TIME.

MATTHEW C. FELIX
STATE COORDINATOR
STATE OFFICE OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
STATE OF ALASKA

Drugs and Public Policy

Bernard Segal, PH.D.

Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies

University of Alaska, Anchorage

The United States has experienced a significant increase in the frequency and intensity of substance abuse, particularly among youth, during the past 20-25 years. The nonmedicinal use of licit and illicit mood altering drugs by elementary, junior and senior high school youth, by college students, and by large segments of the adult population, has become a problem of national concern. Although legal and social sanctions exist to discourage use of psychoactive drugs for recreational or social purposes, these drugs nevertheless continue to be used, and people who use them, especially youth, place themselves at increased risk for health, social and legal problems.

Recent research has noted that, while the prevalence of drug-taking behavior tends to be fairly low among elementary school students, such behavior tends to increase dramatically among junior and senior high school students. The use of drugs among school age youth, and among other segments of society, chiefly young adults18 to 25 years old, began to emerge slowly in the early 1960's and increased steadily during the mid to late 1970's. The widespread experimental use of drugs among youth has even come to be considered normative behavior (in a statistical sense) by some researchers. Although the prevalence of drug-taking behavior may be moderating slightly for both youth and adults, the overall level of drug use remains a problem of significant concern for educational, health, occupational, social service, public safety, insurance, medical and governmental institutions.

Alaska is certainly no exception to this contemporary problem. Indeed, Alaska is experiencing even more of a drug use problem than other states. With its predominant youthful population and its "last frontier" atmosphere,

Alaska is a place where drugs are used at a considerably higher level than in the "lower-48" states. Additionally, the "macho" ethic that prevails in the state, particularly among many young newcomers to the state, also appears to contributes to Alaska's high level of drug-taking behavior. Linked to these phenomena is the fact that Alaska is a developing entity, a place in transition, still struggling to develop its own sense of social identity. This unique situation is manifested in phenomena such as significant upheavals in the life of Alaska Native people who are having to deal with the impacts of industrialization and modernization on their traditional cultures and economies, and a migration pattern within the state linked to a boom-bust economy that involves new immigrants not only having to adjust to living apart from established family roots, but also having to adapt to living in arctic and subarctic environments characterized by extended periods of daylight and darkness. These are but two of the many factors that contribute to place people in Alaska at high risk for both alcohol and drug abuse and adverse legal, social and health consequences.

The level of drug use in the state, as noted above, is exceptionally high. It has been estimated that over half the general population 12 years and older have tried one or more drugs (51.1%), that over a quarter of the population (27.3%) have tried stimulants and that a fifth of the population (19.6%) have tried cocaine. Experiences with other drugs are also very high. Significant concern has been expressed by health authorities that cocaine use is continuing to increase and may be achieving epidemic proportions within the state.

With respect to some of the drug-related impacts within the state, 34 per cent of all drug-related felony arrests during 1982 were for narcotic-related felony offenses (sale and/or possession of opium, cocaine, or heroin), an increase of 28 percent over the years between 1977 and 1981. Of all drug-

related arrests during 1981, 58 per cent represented youth less than 18, and 34 percent were 18 years of age. Fifty-six percent of all drug-related arrests were cocaine-related, 31 percent were marijuana related, 8 percent were heroin-related, and 5 percent involved other drugs. The value of drugs seized during 1982 in Alaska is estimated to have been over $30 million (Department of Health and Social Services, 1983). More than half of both drug- related arrests and the value of drugs seized involve cocaine; it is also estimated that cocaine is distributed on the streets at a markup which is 600% higher than the cost at the point of origin.

Rates on indicators of social instability in Alaska are extremely high, particularly for violent crimes, a large percentage of which are alcohol- and drug-related. Recent reports indicate that Alaska exceeded national rates of violence by 14 percent in 1983 (614 incidents per 100,000 individuals compared to 529 per 100,000 nationally). Alaska, during 1983, also showed the highest rate in the nation for rape (102 per 100,000 individuals compared to 34 per 100,000 nationally), and ranked second for both murders (14 per 100,000 vs. 8 per 100,000 nationally) and aggravated assaults (402 per 100,000 vs. 273 per 100,000 nationally). With a continued influx of over 1,000 new arrivals monthly to the state, many of whom are single (or single parents), young, unemployed and unskilled, the level of drug use is unlikely to decline in the near future.

A great many of those who come to Alaska seek new starts, away from troubles and problems that haunted them in their previous locales. Others also come because they have been lured by the promise of high paying jobs (only to find out that these are generally unavailable). Nevertheless, most of these persons share a desire to be part of the "last frontier" and, as a result, Alaska tends to attract people who bring with them a strong contempt for conformity and for laws that are perceived as infringing on individual freedoms. For many

of these people, laws regulating drugs are interpreted as arbitrary and there is a tendency to disregard them, especially when marijuana is involved. Yet there is also a smaller core of long time Alaskans who tend to represent more traditional values, and who espouse rugged individualism and self-reliance as a way of life, attitudes that are in sharp contrast to those held by many new arrivals. Efforts to deal with drug abuse in the state have thus been met with strong resistance by some groups while intensely advocated by others.

These differences were readily apparent in a recent attempt by the state legislature to strengthen drug laws. As a result of a ruling by the state's Supreme Court (Raven v. State of Alaska, 1975) that ruled that adults could possess marijuana for personal use within their own homes according to the section on Rights to Privacy within Alaska's Constitution, the legislature decriminalized personal use of marijuana. Alaskans could thus possess a small amount of marijuana within their *own* homes for personal use. Alaska's recently revised criminal code (enacted in 1982), in conformance with this ruling, presently allows up to but not including four (4) ounces of marijuana for personal possession under well-defined conditions. The recent proposed change would have reinstated criminal penalties for those caught with even tiny amounts of marijuana, making possession of less than a half pound of marijuana a misdemeanor, punishable by up to 90 days in jail and a $1,000 fine. Possession of greater quantities would carry a maximum sentence of one year in jail and a $5,000 fine. At public hearings addressing this revision, seven of the eight people who testified said the proposed law would make people vulnerable to police action in that the police could bust a *pot party* [italics added] inside a private home. One person testified that the new law would create "a body of criminals out of law-abiding citizens whose only crime is to smoke marijuana in their own homes."

An opposite view on decriminalization was expressed in a Letter to the Editor soon after the above testimony was reported in the newspaper. The author of this letter wrote because of his belief that

> the crude drug marijuana is an extremely destructive and dangerous substance. Once a person is under its influence their own reasoning becomes subservient to the mind-altering chemicals that it contains. The false sense of pleasure that can accompany this chemical 'high' can seduce the brain and result in a psychological dependence and a loss of the ability to experience natural pleasure . . . . Marijuana should no longer be legally available in this state and . . . legislation aimed at ending our liberal laws . . . [should be supported].

Drug use in Alaska, despite the strong anti-drug attitudes held by some of its residents, is nevertheless high. Recent research has shown a clear pattern of drug-taking behavior that is consistent within given age groups across the state. The findings clearly indicate that drug use in Alaska is considerably higher than prevalence rates reported for junior and senior high school students and for the general population in the 48 contiguous states. It needs to be noted, however, that the prevalence statistics being referred to above represent *lifetime experience* with psychoactive drugs, that is, having tried a drug one or more times during one's lifetime. In this respects the statistics are high, but when the state-wide findings are examined further with respect to current usage, less than half of the school sample had used a drug within the past year (of having been sampled), and of those who had used a drug, the clear majority were experimental users, having tried a drug less than five times or once a month or less. The adult sample revealed similar findings in that a large number of respondents had tried a drug one or more

years ago, and only a small percent could be considered to be "heavy" users (less than 10%).

Nevertheless, while reports from research in the "lower-48" states suggest that some aspects of drug use appear to be "leveling off," the Alaskan data suggests the possibility that drug use may not yet have peaked. It is evident that there is a need for identifying some of the factors that contribute to Alaska's high level of drug abuse.

In attempting to understand something about Alaska's current drug-related problems, it is important to realize that Alaska represents a contemporary microcosm of development that other western states went through as they developed from territories into states, especially when their economies were stimulated by rapid population growth and resource development. Thus alcohol and drug-taking behavior, to a large degree, need to be understood in the context of what is happening within the state as a whole with respect to migration patterns and changes in socioeconomic conditions. Another way of stating the problem is that drug use is intricately tied to the (Alaskan) society as a whole and is largely a reflection of the values of that society as expressed by different groups within it.

Given the current situation within Alaska with respect to the extensive level of drug abuse, the public policy issue becomes one of attempting to understand and counteract the high level of drug abuse. The major question that thus arises is how to combat drug abuse.?

Part of the answer lies in curtailing the availability of drugs. When opportunities to try drugs drugs are high, people will try them. Thus law enforcement constitutes an important element in helping to combat drug

abuse. But law enforcement is not the only method to counteract drug abuse. It is important to take note that the recent history of attempts to address drug abuse in the United States has tended to deal with the problem through strong legislation aimed at reducing "drugs on the street" by increasing penalties for possession and use of drugs. Such an approach has led to a preoccupation with and elaboration of penalities associated with drug use which has not generally resulted in an overall reduction of drug use. Quite the contrary, despite severe penalties for possession of cocaine, and clear evidence that it is a dangerous drug, the use of cocaine has risen dramatically during the past few years. Rather than focusing only on the elimination of drugs by legislation, efforts *have* to also be directed toward focusing on people and the circumstances that contribute to their use of drugs. It has been shown that attempts to counteract drug abuse chiefly by means of establishing strong laws and increasing law enforcement efforts put an unfair and sometimes overwhelming burden on the justice system, leading to the unrealistic expectation that this system will eliminate the problem, and it clearly has not eradicated drug abuse.

Legal measures can only be effective if society perceives them to be realistic and reasonable. The experience of decades of having to confront drug abuse in this country makes it clear that without a comprehensive approach the likelihood of reducing drug abuse is low. This comprehensive approach requires the joining together of legal, social, educational, law enforcement, researchers, treatment authorities, and legislative bodies to pool resources, experiences and knowledge to develop an integrated, comprehensive and relevant approach to address the problem of drug abuse within any given community.

In this context drug use and abuse should be vied as a continuum, one end representing experimental use and the other end representing physical

dependency or addiction. The compulsive or extreme use of drugs may lead to disorders or defects of behavior with serious implications for the public safety, health and welfare. Drug dependence or addiction can be considered from two points of view: one relates to the interaction between the drug and the individual; the other to the interaction between drug abuse and society. The first viewpoint is concerned with drug dependence and the interplay between the drug and the psychological status of the person. The second view is concerned with the interaction between drug abuse and society. The question is which of these two perspectives are we to invest in to combat drug abuse, and which has the greatest payoff?

Either choice requires that a price be paid. This price lies in the implications for policy decisions made by governmental bodies regarding drug abuse. However efforts to counteract drug abuse proceed, the level of funds committed to this course of action will have to be sufficient to allow it to succeed. The problem is making the choice in terms of which direction to follow! The problem can be overcome if it is recognized that the problem of drug abuse has to be dealt with both as an individual and societal problem, thereby investing funds in both law enforcement and social programs aimed at prevention, treatment and research. Governmental officials also need to realize that the efforts to combat drug abuse will not always be immediately successful, and that they are difficulty to assess. What is important is the understanding that an investment in a rational program, subject to evaluation, be made. Such a program may be costly at first, but in the long run it will save money that would otherwise be spent on the health, social and legal consequences of drug abuse.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you. The hearing is now adjourned.
[Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned.]

○